BETHEL SEMINARY LIBRARY
REG 227.06 R649
Robertson, A Paul, the interpreter of C
3 0513 0004 0314 3

EX LIBRIS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/paulinterpretero0000atro_q7w5

PAUL THE INTERPRETER OF CHRIST

A. T. ROBERTSON, M.A., D.D., LL.D., LITT.D.

BY PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON

PAUL THE INTERPRETER OF CHRIST.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS FOR STUDENTS OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST. In press.

PRACTICAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY (Exposition of James).

A SHORT GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT. Fifth Edition. Translation into Dutch, French, German, Italian.

A GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH. Fourth Edition, Revised.

JOHN THE LOYAL: A SKETCH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

EPOCHS IN THE LIFE OF JESUS.

EPOCHS IN THE LIFE OF PAUL.

THE PHARISEES AND JESUS. The Stone Princeton Lectures for 1916.

LUKE THE HISTORIAN IN THE LIGHT OF RESEARCH.

THE STUDENT'S CHRONOLOGICAL NEW TESTAMENT.

THE GLORY OF THE MINISTRY.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

PAUL'S JOY IN CHRIST: STUDIES IN PHILIPPIANS.

MAKING GOOD IN THE MINISTRY: A SKETCH OF JOHN MARK.

THE NEW CITIZENSHIP.

COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW: The Bible for Home and School.

STUDIES IN MARK'S GOSPEL.

STUDIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

KEYWORDS IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF JOHN A. BROADUS.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS CONCERNING GOD THE FATHER.

SYLLABUS FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

PAUL THE INTERPRETER OF CHRIST

BY

A. T. ROBERTSON, M.A., D.D., LL.D., LITT.D.

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION,
SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

"That I May Know Him."

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1921,
BY GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

67231

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

506687

TO

THE MEMORY OF

MY SISTER

ANNABEL R. SARTIN

PREFACE

The new books on Paul will never cease and they ought not to cease. If we stop studying Paul, we shall miss much of Christ. The world has never had a man more wholly Christ-filled than Paul. In the present volume no effort is made to tell Paul's life, as is done in my *Epochs in the Life of Paul* and in scores of other books by many writers. I attempt here merely to look at various angles and corners in Paul's life and teaching that have a keen present-day interest. Paul was the most forward-looking man of his generation. We have not yet caught up with his farseeing vision of Christ and of the Kingdom of God.

A. T. Robertson.

Louisville, Kentucky.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Author makes grateful acknowledgment to the publishers of the following periodicals for permission to include in this volume these chapters or parts of chapters which first appeared in their several issues. —*The Review and Expositor, The Expositor (London), The Methodist Review, The Home and Foreign Fields, The Homiletic Review, The Moody Monthly,* and *The Baptist World,* and to further record that this interpretation of Paul grew from the seed sown in the opening lecture of the fall term at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, October 1st, 1911.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Paul the Interpreter of Christ . .	13
II	The Versatility of Paul	40
III	Paul and the Deity of Christ . . .	50
IV	Paul Not a Sacramentarian . . .	59
V	Paul as Church Architect in Corinth	62
VI	Paul's Ecclesiastical Independence .	71
VII	Paul and Patriotism	80
VIII	Paul's Missionary Statesmanship . .	92
IX	Paul's Interest in Young Ministers .	106
X	Paul's Preaching in Thessalonica . .	117
XI	Paul as Pastor in Ephesus	126
XII	Paul in the Center of Greek Culture	141

PAUL THE INTERPRETER OF CHRIST

CHAPTER I

PAUL THE INTERPRETER OF CHRIST

I do not try to get away from the "Charm of Paul," to use Sir W. M. Ramsay's felicitous phrase. He was a tremendous personality, and a real man is always attractive. But, great as Paul was, our chief interest in him lies in his relation to Jesus Christ. This in itself is not a new theme. The Christology of Paul has received adequate treatment at the hands of Alexander, Bruce, Du Bose, Dykes, Everett, Holsten, Lucas, Monteil, Paterson, Pfleiderer, Schmidt, Somerville, Stevens, and B. Weiss. I do not purpose to enter the realm of Biblical Theology in this discussion. My aim is a much narrower one than that of Paul's theology, or even his Christology. I mean to keep close to the path of the historical and exegetical and show how Paul came to be the Interpreter of Christ that he was, how his heritage and environment contributed to his progressive apprehension, how the Epistles necessarily reflected Paul's actual experience which served to reveal new aspects of Christ to Paul. Matheson has ably portrayed the "Spiritual Development of St. Paul," and Sabatier has made a brilliant "Sketch of the Development of His Doctrine." What I have

in mind is rather a combination of these two points of view.

It is hardly worth while to pause long to lay one's critical foundations for such a study. To-day everything is challenged by somebody. Dr. T. K. Cheyne produces the tame and labored conclusion that, after prolonged and unbiased research, he has come to the deliberate conviction that such a man as Paul really lived. We are very grateful for this comforting opinion from the Oxford scholar. No doubt Paul himself is relieved to think that he can now claim historic existence. There is raging at present in Germany a fierce controversy as to whether Jesus ever lived. "The Christ-Myth," by Drews, has gone through a dozen editions. He claims to show that Jesus had no historical reality and is pure myth. Even radical German scholars like Von Soden and J. Weiss have gone into the fray to show that after all Jesus did live in Palestine. Last January, Prof. Shirley J. Case, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, vigorously argued in the Biblical world against the delusion of attributing divinity to Jesus. But he now steps forth to prove against all comers "The Historicity of Jesus." Jesus did live. For this we are grateful. Both Paul and Jesus have historic careers and may be fit subjects of antiquarian interest.

But the path is not yet clear. *The Hibbert Journal* has been the arena of a stiff debate concerning "Jesus or Christ." Granted the historic Jesus, one must not admit the theological Christ. It is gravely argued by these modern wise men that the Jesus of history and the Christ of dogma are wholly different. The Christ

is a mere theological invention, the attribution to the man Jesus of qualities which he did not possess, the deification of the real man Jesus. Prof. W. B. Smith, of New Orleans, has even undertaken to show us the "Pre-Christian Jesus," the man stripped of all the later Christological vagaries, the man as he was. Other voices rise above the confusion and boldly charge Paul with being responsible for having led the world astray from the simple Jesus of the Gospels. He is even called the creator of Christianity, or the perverter, as one may choose. We have just passed through the din of this conflict. The big German guns have exploded and Paul still remains as the Interpreter of Christ. The effort to find a different conception of Christ in the Gospels has failed. Even the Synoptic Gospels have been dubbed Pauline in spirit and the earliest sources of the life of Jesus known to us (Q and Mark) place Jesus on as high a pedestal as does Paul.

Let us then assume the facts in the Gospels and Acts and the Epistles of Paul. That to some will be a violent assumption, but some men have a spasm at any statement of fact. Let us follow Paul in his approach to and apprehension of Christ. He was always pressing on, after he began, to apprehend that for which he was apprehended. He was always on the point of complete success, but the prize slipped on ahead. It was the one great passion of his life. Ἐν δέ. To forget and to push on to the riches in Christ. Do his best, the figure of Christ grew larger before him all the while. Nothing more than an outline of this great theme can be here attempted.

I. *Paul Knowing Christ after the Flesh.*—When Paul first heard of Jesus we do not know. It is hardly probable that he saw Jesus when a student at the seminary of Gamaliel in Jerusalem. Paul had in all likelihood finished his course before the public ministry of Jesus began. He may have remained in Jerusalem, but more likely returned to Tarsus. It is a fascinating theory of some men that Paul came back to Jerusalem in time to see Jesus die on the cross. But we have no evidence of that. When he said (2 Cor. 5:16) that he had once known Christ after the flesh (*κατὰ σάρκα*) he almost certainly means that he once looked on Christ from the fleshly standpoint, "yet now we have known him so no more." He recognized Jesus on the road to Damascus after the explicit statement, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." So then Paul's first approach toward Jesus was along the line of his prejudices. He was taught to hate the new claimant for the Messiahship who had been justly crucified to avoid an insurrection. This brilliant, cultured young Jew had all the patriotic fervor of Judas Maccabeus and the religious pride of the typical Pharisee. He was in touch with the Hellenistic life of the time and had a broader outlook on the world than many Palestinian Jews by reason of his life in Tarsus. He was a Roman citizen and a Hellenist, but he was most of all a Pharisee. The contact with the sect of the Nazarenes inflamed his religious nature and his orthodoxy blazed out with a terrible light. As we see the young man holding the garments while Stephen is stoned, he seems only to possess disqualifications for understanding Jesus of

Nazareth. Every step that he takes in the persecution of the Christians is away from Christ. He becomes the very antithesis of Christ.

II. *Paul Seeing Christ Face to Face.*—It was a violent revulsion in Paul's whole nature when he looked into the face of the Risen Christ. It was the supreme test of his life, like a collision of a steel train. He was going at full speed against Christ and was abruptly halted. The shock was very great to Paul's physical nature. It was even greater to his spiritual equipment. He was thrown to the earth, and blinded in his eyes. But he had seen Jesus, the one whom he had come to hate most of all, though he had not looked upon His face before. He scorned Him for the pestilent heresy caused by His unfortunate life.

In great moments the mind is abnormally active and the essential facts are stamped upon the brain with clearness and vividness. The salient features of this climacteric event never faded from Paul's memory. In speech and letter he repeatedly told of the revolution in his own heart and life. In all essentials the story never varied. It was not of his doing. Jesus manifested Himself to Paul. It was not of Paul's wish nor with his consent. But the undoubted presence and voice of the Risen Jesus convinced Paul that he was hopelessly in error. The look that Jesus gave Paul before he became blind remained with him forever. On that day Light shined into his heart "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4:6). He understood now why Stephen had died rather than give up

that Light that had shined into his own heart. It was here that Paul received his great qualification to interpret Christ. It was in the look that passed between Paul and Jesus. Dr. Dale once said that Mr. Moody had a right to preach since he could not talk about sinners without tears in his eyes. It was full surrender on Paul's part in response to the unutterable compassion of Jesus. As he stood in the white light of Christ's presence Paul saw his own picture silhouetted in the shadow of his sins. No man is qualified to talk about Christ who has not in a real sense seen Him face to face. Paul had an objective vision on a par with the resurrection appearances. The modern preacher cannot claim that experience, but he must have the look into the face of Christ in order to help others to see Jesus. No sadder calamity can befall Christianity than to have men as its exponents who merely mumble what they have read or have heard. Paul was not now able to reconcile his new experience with his old theology, but he could not deny his new experience. On this foundation he will build a new theology and a better one, a scientific theology in the true sense, the reflection of his experience of Christ.

III. *Paul Proving That Jesus Is the Son of God.*— There were good reasons why Paul should say nothing at all. He was a tyro in Christian experience. He had only scraps of Christian theology. He could easily bungle what he did know. He was under suspicion. Ananias who had baptized him had to receive a special revelation before he was willing to baptize him or

lend any endorsement to him as a disciple of Christ. He was known as the chief foe of the disciples of Jesus and he had come to Damascus to arrest those who had fled thither to escape his clutches in Jerusalem. He had with him the official papers of the Sanhedrin for the arrest of the Christians. Paul was wholly on the defensive. The Jews would regard him as a renegade. He was without a friend save Ananias and Judas who were doubtful. He would not get a hearing from Jew or Christian. And yet Paul would not be silent. "Straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that He is the Son of God" (Acts 9:20). He must give his witness. It is a sure mark of the new convert that he must tell others of his new-found joy. Paul was a novice in Christ, but not in mental equipment. He was already a man of high culture, great genius, and much experience in public life though comparatively young. He was trained in public discourse, but his voice must have sounded strange to his own ears as he heard it deliver powerful reasons why Jesus is the Son of God. He was refuting all his old arguments as successfully as Stephen had done. "And all that heard him were amazed" (Act 9:21). It was the voice of a lamb where they had usually heard the voice of the wolf. They were uneasy even now for fear that the wolf might crop out and make havoc as of old with all them that called on the name of Jesus. But Paul had found his voice and stuck to his message till it became familiar as well as sweet to him. He did not have many aspects of Christ that he could describe, but he knew one from personal experience. He knew that Jesus was Messiah, the Son of God. He

had seen Jesus Christ in His risen state. He grasped at once the two-fold nature of Christ, His humanity and His deity. Paul was wise enough to begin with what he knew by experience. He stuck to that and "increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews that dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is the Christ" (Acts 9:22). Paul's first interpretation of Jesus sounded the keynote of his entire ministry. He will never get beyond this truth whatever else he may learn hereafter.

IV. *Paul Adapting Himself to His New Environment.*—It was clear to Paul that he needed a season of retirement in order to take stock of his situation. The rebuffs at Damascus made it all the easier for him to follow his judgment to spend a few years in Arabia. He must make adjustment and take his bearings. The call had come to him from Christ through Ananias at Damascus to go far hence to the Gentiles. Thus had ended the three days of darkness and doubt as to his future. But even so, Christ had not told him to go at once. The way was not now open nor were the Jews anxious to hear him. He had his call, but none to hear. Besides, there was needed a delimitation between his old Judaism and his new Christianity. The two systems must come to terms in his own mind. He had acted on the assumption that they were hostile to each other. Now that he had opened his heart to Christ, how much of his old theology could he carry on with him? He must think the whole matter through in order to see where he stood. We do not know precisely what part of Arabia Paul visited, but

at any rate it was the ancestral home of the Semitic race. He went back to the old haunts of his ancestors whether he actually journeyed as far as Mount Sinai or not. There was in his heart the conflict between law and grace. He was a master in rabbinic lore and Mosaic law, though as yet unskilled in the grace of Christ. But Christ had looked upon him and he would gaze steadfastly into that face till he could blend law and grace. Arabia was the melting pot for Paul's theology. He was probably not wholly alone during this period, but meditations and reflections were predominant. He comes back to his work with a clear vision of the cardinal doctrines of grace. He has come to see how a new Israel is to supplant the old. The new is rooted in the old and is the true realization of the hopes of his people. Paul perceives that the Messianic longings of the Jews have come true in Jesus. It is his task to convince the Jews of this great fact and to help them see the wider outlook of the new Israel which is to include Gentiles as well as Jews. His life in Tarsus had prepared him for this revolution. The experience of Peter on the housetop at Joppa proves how difficult it was for a Jew to conceive of a Gentile in the Kingdom of God except in terms of Jewish racial bonds. So far from the years in Arabia being wasted, they served to lay broad and firm the foundations of Paul's theological system.

V. *Paul Winning an Ear for His Interpretation of Christ.*—It was not a new Christ that Paul had to preach, but he had a more just perspective of the world-mission of Christ than any of the apostles had yet

grasped. Peter had said at Pentecost that the message was to them that were afar off, but he later showed that he understood that to mean that Gentiles would become Jews. Stephen had seen the matter more simply in its true spiritual nature as Jesus had taught the woman of Samaria that the worship of God was not bound by temple or tribe. And now Paul was taking up this larger conception of Stephen as his own life-task. Would he meet the fate of Jesus and of Stephen? The liberalizing of social and religious prejudice is a perilous undertaking for any man. But Paul's path is clear before him. He will heed the call of Christ to bear the message to the Gentiles. He knows also that he must suffer for Christ in so doing. But the vision has come to him and he will not be disobedient to it whatever befall him. It is good for Paul that as he returns to Damascus he does not know the details of his future career. God mercifully veiled that from him. He will take up his burden day by day. He is conscious of a richer experience and fuller knowledge as he expounds anew the things of Christ in Damascus. There is proof of his fresh power in the plot of the Jews to kill him. He is not a negligible quantity. Paul had taught the Jews how to kill people for the crime of being Christians. They are now practising what he taught them, and Paul was not successful in convincing the Jews of Damascus that Christianity was the true Judaism, that Jesus was in truth the Messiah of their hopes. He was not able to answer his former arguments, in their opinion. But he has won the confidence of the Christians. He won converts to Christ to some extent, for we read of "his

disciples" who planned his escape. It was a desperate beginning and a lonely retreat, but Paul was unafraid. He went straight on to Jerusalem. He would tell his new story in the presence of Gamaliel himself if he would hear it. If Paul had been fainthearted, he would surely have hesitated to come back to Jerusalem. Once he had been the joy and pride of the Sanhedrin; now he is the victim of their scorn and hate. Once the disciples had fluttered and fled with dread at his approach. He is cut to the quick to note how they shrink from him still. The smell of fire is on him yet. There was no sympathy in Jerusalem for Paul, no ear for his message. It was enough to throw a weak nature into despair. Paul was sensitive and felt it keenly, as any preacher does who finds his person and his message unwelcome. It is an honor to Barnabas that he had the insight and the courage to see what was in Paul. On this endorsement Peter and John opened their hearts to the new recruit. Paul had two weeks of blessed fellowship with Peter (ἱστορῆσαι). Peter knew at any rate that Paul was a man of parts. He had made the disciples feel his steel. It is no discredit to Peter to say that he could not have foreseen how great a man he was dealing with at this juncture nor how Paul would one day become the chief apostle of Christ and rob Peter of his primacy as an exponent of Christ. There was no jealousy between them, and Peter could tell Paul many facts about the life of Christ, but Paul had already made his interpretation of Christ, so that he could later say that Peter added nothing to his knowledge of Christ. It was a novel experience to Paul to preach Christ in the Hellenistic

synagogues of Jerusalem. He did it with such power as Stephen had done before that the Grecian Jews were about to kill him. The Lord Jesus had to appear to Paul in a trance in the temple and bid him depart, for the Jews there would not hear him.

VI. *Paul Pleading the Case with the Jews.*—We are not following closely the story of Paul's life. The years at Tarsus were not wasted. The opportunity came at Antioch for which Paul had long waited. This again was due to Barnabas. Paul and Barnabas have had a specific call of the Holy Spirit to go on a world campaign to win the Gentiles to Christ. They have not found the task easy. In order to get at the Gentiles, they find it wise to preach to the Jews. Many Gentiles had business connections with the Jews. Some attended worship in the synagogues. Besides, there had been no command to slight the Jews for the Gentiles. At Antioch in Pisidia Paul had the opportunity to plead the cause of Christ before Jews and devout Gentiles. Fortunately we have preserved full notes of this discourse, which is the earliest statement with any fullness of Paul's conception of Christ. The accuracy of Luke in his reports of Paul's speeches is well vindicated by Maurice Jones, in his book *St. Paul the Orator.* Paul has now been a preacher of Christ some ten or twelve years. He has put to the test his interpretation of Jesus. He is in no sense apologetic or timid. He is no longer a tyro, though a stranger to this particular audience. Certainly he has now learned how to put his view of Christ to a Jewish audience with more suavity and winsomeness

than was true at Damascus and Jerusalem. The whole point of his sermon is to show that Jesus is the promise made to David. He speaks from the Jewish standpoint about the Jewish Messiah. Paul shows clear knowledge of John the Baptist and his relation to Christ. He states the facts of Christ's death and resurrection and expounds the significance of both of these great events. He gives the core of his system of theology which is justification by faith in Christ, who died on the cross for the remission of our sins. He shows that the law of Moses could not justify the Jews before God. It was all very wonderful and strange and yet very attractive. They wanted to hear more about it. On the next Sabbath the jealousy of the Jewish leaders led Paul to turn to the Gentiles instead of the Jews. But we have caught a glimpse of Paul's point of view and method with Jews. We see his skill in this matter also as he speaks to the mob from the steps of the tower of Antonia, and later before Agrippa in Cæsarea. He is thoroughly at home in all Jewish questions and seems the man of all men to speak with the Jewish people about Christ. In the last chapter of Acts we see Paul pleading with the Jews of Rome to accept the Kingdom of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, and the partial success obtained there. In Rom. 9-11 Paul reveals his own passionate love for the Jews, his own kinsmen in the flesh.

VII. *Paul Stating the Case to the Gentiles.*—The real work of Paul was to be with the Gentiles. This was the call of Christ made long ago. The Jews themselves drove Paul more and more to preach to the

Greeks and the Romans. As the Jews spurned Paul and his gospel, he dramatically and proudly turned to the Gentiles. *They will hear,* he had said to the Jews in Rome. He knew that by blessed experience. The Gentiles persecuted Paul also. At first they were put up to it by the Jews. But on the whole the Gentiles gave an attentive ear to Paul. He glorified his ministry and marvelled that Christ should have intrusted to him, the least of all saints, this grace to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. Paul evidently felt that he was not so well qualified to speak to the Greek as to the Jew. His education was Jewish and his pride and prejudices ran in that direction. He had come to see that Christianity was the true Judaism. He had overcome his difficulties in that respect. It was a gigantic task to grapple with the syncretistic religions of the Græco-Roman world of that period. Babylon, Egypt, Syria, Greece and Rome had all contributed their share to make a mongrel brood. Astarte, Isis, Diana, and Venus polluted the life of the time. The emperor-cult had displaced and degraded the old worship of Zeus and his circle of deities. False philosophy had triumphed over the nobler ideals of Socrates and Plato. Epicurean and Stoic contended in the market-place with any chance comer just for the sake of argument. Mithraism held many in its grip by its mysticism and magic. Gnosticism was already showing signs of life. One needed to be cyclopædic in knowledge and masterful in interpretation to be able to win a hearing for a new religion in a world already badly overstocked and disgusted with what it had. But God had His man ready. Paul

was reared in Tarsus, the home of a great Greek university and of philosophers also, a center of Greek and Roman life. The tides of the Roman world ran through Tarsus, and Paul is never greater than in his power to take the very language of the various cults of the time and charge it with Christian meaning. He does this time and again. Thus he gets a hearing from the man in the street. He was a man of the schools. But he knew how to talk in the tongue of his time. He could be understood. A typical example of Paul's skill in this respect is seen in the wonderful address on Mars Hill. In the midst of all that was great in Athens and before Epicureans and Stoics, Paul made a most persuasive statement of the gospel of Christ in such a way as to turn to his advantage all his surroundings and yet to bring out many of the fundamental doctrines. He made some impression also upon the fickle Athenians. How well Paul succeeded with the Gentiles is seen in the long line of churches planted by him in Asia and Europe. In his Epistles he will glory in the power of the Cross of Christ. It was foolishness to the Greeks at first, but to many it became the wisdom of God.

VIII. *Paul Looking for Christ's Return.*—In Athens Paul was face to face with Greek philosophy and sought to preach Christ in the teeth of it. At Thessalonica just before, it was the power of the Roman empire that confronted him in all its pressure on the spirit of man. He has gone on to Corinth where he writes, but the great problems of Thessalonica are on his heart. There he felt keenly the conflict

between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdom of Rome. He foresaw the inevitable grapple between these two great forces for the mastery of the world. He found hope in the coming of Jesus to claim his own. It was natural that this hope should be brighter in the earlier stages of the apostolic history. The subject was left in doubt by Christ Himself as to the time. The disciples were charged to be ready. There is no doubt that this steady hope cheered them through the first years of separation from Him. Some came to look for Him at once. It was hard to preach on the topic without creating a false impression. Hope would so easily become certainty. So it happens that the very first group of Paul's Epistles deals with last things. Eschatology is to the fore in the beginning in the apocalyptic language of the time, but it gradually receded as time went by. Paul never lost his conviction that Christ would come again nor should we, but other topics came to occupy his heart more as the years flew by. Indeed, the two Thessalonian Epistles are written chiefly to correct misapprehension about what Paul had said on this subject. It is so easy to be misunderstood. Some had understood him to say that those already dead would have no share in the second coming. Others drew the inference that since Christ was coming at once, there was no need to work. So Paul has to deny that he said that Jesus was coming right away, indeed the Man of Sin loomed large in the horizon before that event. This conflict with Rome did begin all too soon and lasted much longer than Paul knew. In the Thessalonian Epistles, therefore, Jesus appears in a very personal and real way to Paul.

He mentions various items about His life and death and aspects of faith in Him as Lord, on a par with God the Father. He is the Son of God, raised from the dead, who will surely come back again. Salvation is through the atoning death of Christ. The Christian meanwhile lives in Christ as the sphere of his activity and the ground of his hope. These are not doctrinal Epistles, but Paul's great doctrines are here in the most incidental form. To understand Paul's standpoint then one must look back across the eighteen years that have passed since he met Jesus on the Damascus road. It is all a matter of course with Paul now, but the fire of love and faith burns bright. He is not blasé. Christianity is not stale nor is preaching perfunctory. He meets every new situation with the alertness of youth and finds Christ adequate for everything.

IX. *Paul Justifying the Cross of Christ.*—Paul's Epistles may not be a complete picture of his conception of Christ. We have very few of Paul's many sermons. He may have written other letters. He knew things about Christ which it was unlawful to utter. But, so far as they go, the letters do justly reveal Paul's apprehension of the mystery of Christ, as he himself said (Eph. 3:3f.). They go very far indeed. They are the greatest letters of history, and sound depths and scale heights that baffle the most of us. I am not attempting here an outline of Paul's life nor an exposition of his Epistles, but merely to draw a pastel, so to speak, of the background of Paul's growing knowledge of Christ. I am using the Epistles as a revelation of Paul's progressive apprehension of Christ.

It is some four years later that Paul writes First Corinthians. He is in Ephesus, and is cut to the heart over the troubles in the church at Corinth. He has lived to see the sad sight of a church split over the merits of various preachers, including himself. They have appealed to Paul for help and he has to speak. The divisions led to or helped on various vices and weaknesses. Paul feels called on to defend his style of preaching in Corinth. Cephas had not been there and Apollos was acknowledged to be eloquent. Paul makes his defense by showing how he did right in determining to preach only Christ Jesus and Him crucified. It was bad enough as it was. If Paul had pandered to the false tastes and low standard of the Corinthians by flashy oratory and superficial philosophy, he could have made a greater name for himself and ruined the church. As it turned out many scoffed at the foolishness of his preaching the Cross of Christ. But his chief joy in it all is that he laid no other foundation in Corinth than Christ Jesus. The Cross of Christ is the truest wisdom for it is God's wisdom. It is a great apologetic for the Cross that Paul makes in that Epistle and one that is extremely pertinent now. The heart of Paul's message is the Cross and the resurrection of Christ as proving His power over death on the Cross. Paul apparently moves in a new realm on this subject, but we have seen the same point of view in the sermon at Antioch in Pisidia. His mastery of this great theme shows that he had often preached on it and thought it through. He wields this weapon with great power.

X. *Paul Beholding the Glory of God in Christ.*—Second Corinthians is the most personal of all Paul's Epistles. He is at white heat. The crisis has come at Corinth. Paul is in flight from Ephesus. He has met Titus in Philippi, with much agitation of spirit. He writes with heart all aglow with emotion. He seems to catch a fresh glimpse of the face of Jesus. He lifts the whole discussion of the ministry out of the sordid atmosphere of Corinth, and places it on the pinnacle of spiritual communion with God in Christ. The eternal relation of the soul with God in Christ is here seen with marvelous clearness. This Epistle is a Pierian spring for every preacher who is racked with cares and ecclesiastical worries. Paul is able to sing so nobly because he is sure of the presence of Christ with him. He has real rapture with Christ. Nothing else really matters now. He is the slave of Christ in God's triumphal march through the ages. He is an incense-bearer with the sweet savor of Christ unto God, whatever men may think. So he is confident in Christ with unveiled face before the whole world. The light of God is in his heart through Christ, and for Jesus' sake he will endure anything. He is anxious to be at home with the Lord, but meanwhile will endeavor to be well-pleasing unto Him as His ambassador. The love of Christ holds him fast to his great task. The power of Christ is with him in his weakness. The glory of Christ ennobles men and Paul glories in the possibilities of all in Christ.

XI. *Paul Battling for Liberty in Christ.*—The date of Galatians is much disputed, and the book has no

very clear earmarks of time save the note of protest against the effort of the Judaizers to fasten the Mosaic ritual on the Gentiles. That effort was made as early as A.D. 50, after Paul's return from the first mission tour as is seen in Acts 15. Paul took a bold stand for freedom from the ceremonial law for all Gentile Christians. He won the support of the Apostles at Jerusalem and saved the day, but the Judaizers would not stay defeated. They reopened the controversy at Antioch and followed Paul's travels in Corinth and Galatia. The Epistle to the Galatians is the bugle-blast of liberty. It seems to come just after Second Corinthians and has much of the same heat as that great Epistle. Paul here conceives Christ in His universal relation as the emancipator from the shackles of traditional ceremonialism. In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female. It is a great conception and is triumphant proof of Paul's statesmanlike grasp of great issues in that he saw at once and continually how much was at stake. Spiritual Christianity was in peril and under God Paul saved that blessed heritage in Christ for us all. He brushed aside the Pharisaic pretensions to exclusive prerogatives in the Kingdom of God. Paul saw that class and national lines did not run through Christ. In Galatians he seizes upon the root ideas in Christ's mission and applies them to the cause of human freedom and progress. Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ made you free. Paul had drawn the picture of Christ with a bold hand before the eyes of the Galatians. He cannot understand how, once having seen Christ, they can go back to the weak and beggarly

elements of rabbinism. That message is good for all time as a protest against the bondage of mere tradition and ritual. It is vital union with Christ that Paul covets. Christ lives in Paul and he is crucified with Christ.

XII. *Paul Expounding Redemption in Christ.*— No condensed statement can do justice to Paul's reasoned exposition of the varied relations of Christ to all the phases of the work of redemption as wrought out in the Epistle to the Romans. It is not merely that Paul is here seen at his best, in the prime of his mental powers, on the greatest of themes, and with sufficient space to give play to his great genius. Paul in Romans gives his gospel. In a true sense Paul's evangel is the full and finest evangel of all (cf. Whyte, Thomas Shepherd, p. 18). It is not a new gospel; it is the one that Paul had joyfully preached to the Gentiles. Nowhere does Paul make it clearer that Christ is the center of all his thinking and actions. The heart of his argument turns on the fact that Jesus made propitiatory offering for our sins by His blood on the cross, which offering is mediated to us by faith in Christ as our Redeemer so that God freely justifies us and declares us righteous and will ultimately make us righteous. There are great words in Romans like righteousness, santification, redemption, propitiation, faith, justification, power, reconciliation, salvation, no condemnation, life, victory, sons, adoption, heirs. But they are all meaningless to Paul, apart from Christ. Christ is here seen as the sole means of righteousness, the sole hope of redemption, the

pledge of all good. In Christ we are more than conquerors. Christ will never desert us till He takes us to the Father. In Christ Paul defies all the forces of evil in earth and hell. He stands upon the Rock of Ages and faces the devil. He writes from Corinth with the storm at Jerusalem gathering in the distance, but he is not afraid. Christ is over all God blessed forever (according to the probable punctuation in 9:5). He is Son of David and Son of God.

XIII. *Paul Learning Humility from Christ.*— Paul has been long a prisoner in Cæsarea and Rome when he writes to the Philippians. His spirit is chastened and humbled. The proud eagle looks out and sees the crags which he cannot reach. Paul is confident, indeed, that he will be set free again, but meanwhile he has learned how to be content. He has come to see that Christ is his very life. He is in a real sense living over the life of Christ. He is emboldened to urge that the Philippians have the mind that was in Christ. The greatest words that Paul utters about Christ seem to come out incidentally. It is so with the great passage in Phil. 2 on the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. We see Christ in His preexistent state of glory, His lowly life and death, His consequent greater exaltation. Paul betrays intense passion for Christ in Phil. 3. He places his old life and theology in the scales with his new life and joy in Christ. That is but refuse beside Christ, who overtops all earthly pride and pomp. And yet it is an elusive chase. Christ lures him on to higher heights of service and fellowship. He knows the joy of this rap-

turous chase, for the goal is Christ, who is never out of sight, ever beckoning him on. He sees the foregleam of the riches of glory in Christ.

XIV. *Paul Showing the Supremacy of Christ.*—In Rome, Paul is made aware of a new heresy in Asia which he had foreseen in his address to the elders of Ephesus at Miletus. This hybrid philosophy and speculative Essenism degraded Christ to the rank of an *æon* or angel. The Pauline Christology is now attacked at the center and Paul steps out into the open to show that Jesus and Christ are one and the same (cf. the "Jesus or Christ" controversy in *The Hibbert Journal*), that Jesus was a real man and died on the cross for our sins, that Christ is the very image of God, and the First-born before all creation, that Christ is the author of creation, and the sustainer of the created universe, that He is supreme in the work of nature and given head over all. Christ is the key of the universe, the reconciler between man and God and man and man (the true Peace-maker), the mystery of God, the fullness of all the Godhead in bodily form. Christ is all and in all. Christ is our ideal and our goal. We are hid with Christ in God. No higher word has ever been spoken of Christ than Paul utters in Colossians in refuting the Gnostic error.

XV. *Paul Unfolding the Glory of Christ's Body.*—Ephesians is the complement of Colossians. God has summed up all in Christ. He is the fullness of God. In a real sense we are the fullness of Christ, that is "we all," the church general or the kingdom. Christ

is the head as is shown in Colossians. The body of the head is the church, the spiritual church. We are made alive in Christ, created in Him for good works. Nowhere is the dignity of human nature so well brought out as in Ephesians. We are to grow up *into* Christ, to become one new man, one full man in Him, in some sense worthy of Him, our Head. We are one in Him, both Jew and Gentile. The middle wall of partition is broken down. Peace and love have come instead. He is the chief cornerstone and we are built into the great temple of God's redeemed humanity. The riches of Christ are unsearchable and His love past all comprehension and all telling. But we are destined to sit in the heavenlies with Christ Jesus.

XVI. *Paul Trusting in Christ Jesus, His Hope.*— The Pastoral Epistles show the tender side of Paul's nature. He is an old man. Christ put him into the ministry, counting him worthy. It is still a marvel to Paul how He came to do it. But he is deeply grateful. The lesson of it all is that Jesus is the Saviour of sinners. He is the Mediator between God and man, the ransom for all, the one Potentate, King of kings, and Lord of lords, our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ. He abolished death and brought life and immortality to light. He has helped Paul all the way. He stood by him in his last trial when all others were absent. And Paul is ready for the glorious end. He has finished his course, he has kept the faith, he sees the martyr's crown ready for him. He is willing to be offered up for Jesus' sake. Christ is all and in all to Paul. This is his own heart's experience. This

is his testimony in his Epistles. He has tested Christ all over the Roman Empire, by land and sea, with friend and foe. Christ has never failed him. Paul is qualified to interpret Christ out of the wealth of his experience of Christ. The best tribute to Paul is for us to learn to know Christ and the power of His resurrection. Paul was able to say at the end of the day: "I know him whom I have believed and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." He had committed (παραθήκη) his all to Christ. Soon he would see Him again face to face. He will know even as Christ has known him through all the years.

The address, given above, was delivered in 1911. In the same year appeared the third edition of Knowling's "Testimony of St. Paul and Christ." The stream of criticism concerning Paul continues. Early in 1912 Schweitzer's *Paul and His Interpreters* (translated by Montgomery) appeared with trenchant criticism of previous efforts to understand Paul. The Reformation of Luther fought and conquered in the name of Paul, but did not advance the historical knowledge of Paul (p. 2). His summary is that "the study of Paulinism has nothing very brilliant to show for itself in the way of scientific achievement" (p. 237). He brushes aside the efforts to explain away Paul as unhistorical and the Epistles as not genuine (Steck, Van Manen). He sees good in the Tübingen criticism in that it compelled the study of the sources of our knowledge, but it failed to understand Paul who is more than a narrow Jew. He is not a mere sacramentarian as will be shown and was little influenced by the Mystery-Re-

ligions save in the use of some technical terms (Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions* (1913). But Schweitzer finds in Paul's eschatology the key to his life and teaching which he took over from the Baptist and Jesus (p. 243). This view that Paul took a false line from eschatology and the sacraments and the Mystery-Religions is presented by Morgan in his able volume, *The Religion and the Theology of St. Paul* (1917). Prof. H. A. A. Kennedy has a keen criticism of it in *The Expositor* (September, 1917). M. Jones has no doubt that the new attack on Paul from the side of comparative religion will be successfully repelled with a great increase of our knowledge of the Græco-Roman world in which Paul labored (Pauline Criticisms in the Present Day, *The Expositor,* July, 1917, p. 31). Jones thinks that recent years have seen a striking and a gratifying change in the study of Paul (p. 16). Progress has been made in the knowledge of the chronological data in Paul's life as M. Jones has shown in his discussion of Plooij's conclusions on that subject (*The Expositor,* May, June, August, 1919). Deissmann thinks that Paul has been doubly misunderstood as a man of culture instead of a tentmaker like Amos the herdsman of Tekoa (*St. Paul,* 1911, p. 6), in which view he greatly underestimates Paul. As a result he holds that his letters have been misunderstood as literary Epistles (p. 8) to the obscuration of their purpose and meaning. Here again a truth has been overstated by Deissmann. Paul was both a man of the schools and a workman. He wrote personal Letters, but at times with the literary grace and dignity of Epistles. David Smith has pro-

duced a great study of the Apostle, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul* (1920), on the scale of Conybeare and Howson, in which he surveys with breadth of scholarship the old and the new knowledge of Paul, but with a touch of condescension at times out of keeping with the facts. Hayes does not call Paul the greatest theologian. He reserves that honor for John (*Paul and His Epistles,* 1915, p. 487). That is a matter of judgment, but Hayes admits that Paul's influence as an interpreter of Christ has been greater than that of John. Perhaps the truth is that John saw deeper into the mind and heart of Christ by the singleness of his gaze and the length of his fellowship with Christ. Paul is a man of more genius and more variety and of a wider culture and of a more practical turn of mind. He has seen more sides of Christ and of Christianity than John and has interpreted more aspects of Christ for more kinds of men. However, Paul remains today, as of old, the chief Interpreter of Jesus Christ for modern men. He cannot be gotten rid of. His grip on the mind of modern Christians is unshaken in spite of all criticism and progress. We must go back to Christ, but we must go by way of Paul. John shows Paul's influence as do Luke and Mark. Peter and Barnabas felt the force of Paul's leadership. That leadership is still dominant, for Paul knew Christ after the Spirit of God.[1]

[1] Bacon's new volume, *Jesus and Paul* (1921), came into my hands as I was correcting the proof of this volume. McNeile's *St. Paul* (1920) is a masterly study.

CHAPTER II

THE VERSATILITY OF PAUL

The cry of "Back to Christ" has not disposed of Paul. The great Apostle continues to give criticism a busy time. He is accused of having perverted the simple gospel of the kingdom as preached by Jesus into an abstract theology foreign to the thought and purpose of Christ. He is called the second founder of Christianity, in reality the destroyer of the Christianity of Christ. So we have had the "Jesus or Paul" controversy.[1] The battle is still raging over the Pauline Christology, and several recent volumes [2] treat this topic. Paul is condemned by some for rabbinising

---

[1] Breitenstein, *Jésus et Paul*, 1908; Heine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus*, 1902; *Goguel, L'apôtre Paul et Jésus Christ*, 1904; Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus*, 1910; Kaftan, *Jesus und Paulus*, 1906; Knowling, *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, 1911 (second ed.); A. Meyer, *Jesus or Paul* (tr.), 1909; Reid, *Jesus the Christ and Paul the Apostle in the Light of Modern Criticism*, 1915; Resch, *Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*, 1904; C. A. Scott, *Jesus and Paul* (Cambridge Biblical Essays, 1909); J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus* (tr.), 1909; Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, 1921.

[2] Allen, *The Christology of St. Paul*, 1912; Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, 1909; Olchewski, *Die Wurzeln der paulinischen Christologie*, 1909; Rostron, *The Christology of St. Paul*, 1912; Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, 1912. See also R. H. Strachan's *The Individuality of St. Paul*, 1916.

Christianity, though Montefiore[1] thinks that he did not properly understand Judaism which he denounces. Sir W. M. Ramsay contends in his books on Paul that he was familiar with the best things in current Hellenism, though he was a thorough Jew at bottom. "A Palestinian Jew could never have grown into the Apostle of the Græco-Roman world" (Ramsay, *The Hellenism of Paul* in the *Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day,* 1913, p. 32). But Principal A. E. Garvie[2] disputes both the quantity and the quality of this Greek training of Paul. "In the mind of Paul a universalised Hellenism coalesced with a universalised Hebraism" (Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul,* p. 73). Indeed, the mystery-religions[3] of the Græco-Roman world are held by some to be the determining factor in Paul's theology, a view ably answered by Professor H. A. A. Kennedy,[4] but still advocated by Professor W. Morgan in his now famous volume, *The Religion and Theology of St. Paul,* 1917, clearly refuted also by Professor Kennedy in *The Expositor*[5] for August and September, 1917. Dr. Maurice Jones[6] considers this onslaught on the orthodox view of Paul parallel in importance with the crisis raised by the criticism of Baur: "I have no doubt that this attack will be as

---

[1] *Judaism and St. Paul,* 1915, p. 87.

[2] *Studies of Paul and His Gospel,* 1911, p. 8; *The Expositor,* May, 1911, pp. 376 ff.

[3] Cf. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterien-religionen,* 1910.

[4] *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions,* 1913.

[5] *A New Interpretation of Paulinism.*

[6] "Pauline Criticism in the Present Day," *The Expositor,* July, 1917, p. 31.

successfully repelled as was that of Baur, and that in the providence of God another Lightfoot will arise who, with a wider knowledge of the history of religion as a whole, and with a truer insight into the real significance of the development of Christian doctrine than those possessed by this school of critics, will do for the integrity and continuity of St. Paul's doctrine what Lightfoot did for the authenticity of the Epistles." [1] I heartily agree with this prophecy. But even before the new Lightfoot comes, it is possible for us to keep our balance about Paul. Schweitzer, in his *Paul and His Interpreters* (1912), is merciless in the keenness and the force of his criticisms of ancient and modern interpreters of Paul. One recognises the pungency of his points till he undertakes himself to explain Paul's theology from the standpoint of eschatology alone.

So we go round in an endless circle or fly off at a tangent. Now we are told that Paul is a sacramentarian, this latest attempt to explain Paul by one idea. Even the able Heinrich J. Holtzmann went over to this view, and Professor H. T. Andrews argued in *The Expositor* for November, 1916, that this was now a settled fact with which evangelical Christians must reckon. My brief protest against claiming Paul as a sacramentarian was followed by an extended and adequate defence [2] of the spiritual nature of Paul's message by Professor W. H. Griffith-Thomas, of

---

[1] *The Expositor*, February, 1917.

[2] *The Expositor*, May, 1917, "The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul."

Toronto.[1] Professor G. G. Findlay has sounded a needed note in his able article on "The Unity of St. Paul's Teaching," in the July *London Quarterly Review.* The apparently contradictory elements in Paul's teaching admit of easy and natural synthesis if once we let Paul be his own interpreter. This Dr. Findlay shows with characteristic ability. Paul was not an intellectual and theological chameleon, a mere jellyfish. He was "all things to all men," not because of mental flabbiness, but "that I may by all means save some" (1 Cor. ix. 22). This dominant purpose runs through all of Paul's thinking and working. He was not drifting about picking up scraps of wisdom in the Agora of Athens, as the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers sneered (Acts xvii. 18), but a great constructive thinker with a true philosophy of history and of life. He was not grasping at straws to save himself, but he was projecting a great campaign to evangelise the Roman world for Christ. He lived among men, to be sure, and was no scholastic recluse out of touch with men, though not a mere artisan as Deissmann argues in his *St. Paul.* We shall never understand Paul's gospel till we understand "the Individuality of St. Paul" (R. H. Strachan, 1916). The notion that Paul was a borrower and made a patchwork of his theology, a kind of ill-assorted crazy-quilt, is not new. Lightfoot treated with great lucidity and force the alleged relations between Paul and Seneca in his commentary on Philippians. It is idle to assert that Paul was a Stoic because he shows familiarity

[1] Now of Philadelphia.

with the current Stoic maxims. Ramsay is fully justified in terming Paul a philosopher, the greatest of philosophers. In like manner he knew the dialect and intellectual method of the rabbis and does not hesitate on occasion to adopt the rabbinic method of argument to turn a point with his Jewish opponents (cf. Gal. iii. 16, 20). He can use allegory with more purpose than Philo (Gal. iv. 21-31). But it is as foolish to call Paul a disciple of Philo as of Zeno. "To the Jew I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law: to them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law" (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21). In this important passage Paul has interpreted his own method. It is still true that Paul is the best interpreter of Paulinism—better than Baur, Pfleiderer, Wernle, Weinel, and all the rest.

The critics of Paul confess their failure to understand him. Findlay[1] quotes Pfleiderer as finding "no alternative but to admit that Paul kept the two different kinds of conceptions (Judaic and Hellenic) in his consciousness side by side but unrelated, and jumped from one to the other without being aware of the

[1] *London Quarterly Review,* July, 1917, p. 76. Rev. E. S. Waterhouse has a trenchant criticism of the German "tendency to give a wholesale application of one particular fact, rule or method to all instances" (p. 199, *The Contemporary Review,* August, 1917) in an article entitled "Theology without Germany."

opposition between them." This is naïve, but it misunderstands Paul and quite misses the point. Paul was a Jew with Pharisaic training, an expert rabbi of the schools, and lived in the Græco-Roman world and felt the currents of thought and life all about him; but he was now first of all a slave of Jesus Christ. He does not look at Christ now from the Jewish, now from the Greek standpoint. He is interpreting Christ now to Jews, now to Greeks. His conception of Christ and of the gospel is not a jumble, but a single whole. He varies his terminology to make himself the better understood by different auditors, just as great preachers do to-day. Paul even calls a Cretan poet a "prophet," to add point to the quotation, without meaning to endorse the poet as on a par with Christian teachers. The antitheses in Paul's language are, like the paradoxes of Jesus, to be interpreted by the main body of his teaching. Weinel misses the point when he asserts that "in St. Paul's writings we have two forms of religion—the sacramental and the purely spiritual—standing side by side without any attempt at co-ordination." Language is at bottom figurative, and it is easy to ride the figures to death. It gives one a queer feeling at the heart to read that Paul did not know whether he was a sacramentarian or a preacher of spiritual Christianity. It is refreshing at any rate to find a moderate sacramentarian, like W. H. P. Hatch,[1] contending for faith as the keynote in Paul's system: "Therefore, although the present writer be-

[1] *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion*, 1917, p. 85.

lieves that Paul thought of baptism and the Lord's supper in a sacramental way, it seems to him in the highest degree inaccurate and misleading to call Pauline Christianity a mystery-religion. It is much more just and reasonable to say that it is a religion of faith, belonging to the sphere of psychology and ethics rather than to that of mystery or magic." "For faith alone, as we have seen, is the fundamental principle of Pauline Christianity."

We must learn how to put first things first with Paul. He was not a faddist. He did not jump from one extreme to another. There was one great crisis in his life, a spiritual and intellectual revolution, his conversion. Up to that great event, when Jesus revealed Himself to Paul, his life ran a straight and consistent course as the champion of Pharisaism that came to blows with Christianity (Gal. i. 13, 14). He was equally consistent afterwards in his zealous pursuit [1] of Christ (Phil. iii. 12). This whole great passage (Phil. iii. 1-16) is Paul's *apologia* for his change from rabbinism to Christ, and his consistent and persistent adherence to Christ as the one thing [2] worth while in life. Christ dominates Paul's whole soul; Christ is his passion, his very life. All else is secondary and subordinate. The man who asserted his apostolic authority as independent and on a par with that of Peter, James and John, the Jerusalem pillars (Gal. i. and ii.), was not likely to be carried away by the will-o'-the-wisps of lesser lights.

---

[1] διώκω

[2] ἓν δέ

If his grasp of Gentile freedom and the truth of the spiritual gospel was strong enough to shake off the tyranny of the Judaisers, the powerful Pharisaic element in Jerusalem Christianity (1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans), Paul was equally clear-sighted in his detection of the sophistries of nascent Gnosticism (Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastorals). If he was able to proclaim the second coming of Christ with sanity, and not go to the excesses of the wild eschatological apocalyptists (1 and 2 Thessalonians), he was certainly competent to fathom the subtleties of Mithraism without becoming a victim of its vagaries (cf. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*).

Paul is entitled to fair treatment at the hands of criticism. The great majority of his epistles are now accepted as genuine. Few scholars now dispute the Pauline authorship of the four great epistles admitted by Baur (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans), and 1 Thessalonians, Colossians and Philippians. These are enough to explain all the sides of Paul's teaching, he being his own interpreter. Most assuredly we are to welcome all the new light from the study of eschatology, apocalyptic, Pharisaism, the papyri, the inscriptions, the emperor-cult, Mithraism and other mystery-religions, Stoicism and all Hellenic culture, Philo, the apocryphal wisdom literature. These all went to make Paul's world and Paul lived in his world with eyes and ears wide open. But it is utterly unjust to this many-sided man, this versatile genius, who made use of all forms of language that gave promise of helping him to interpret "the un-

searchable riches of Christ" (Eph. iii. 8), if we seek the key to his message and life in one of these subordinate and contributory streams of influence rather than in the main source of all. Paul was a close student of the Old Testament, but he interpreted the sacred scriptures in the light of the Cross of Christ. He interpreted the circumcision of Abraham as the seal of the faith which he already had while in uncircumcision (Rom. iv. 10, 11). He refused to make baptism essential to salvation (1 Cor. i. 14-17), but made it the symbol of death to sin and burial of the old life and resurrection to the new life in Christ (Rom. vi. 3-7). It is not fair to Paul to read into his language the sacramental ideas of current Mithraism when he pointedly interprets his idea in the non-sacramental sense, especially when the sacramental meaning contravenes Paul's repeated slogan of salvation by faith, not by works of the law (Rom. iii. 27, 28). It is more natural to say that the critics who make Paul give up the main thesis of his message, salvation by grace, are mistaken when they so interpret phrases that *per se* are capable of a sacramental meaning.

It is not the first time that critics have disposed of Paul to their own satisfaction, but he has remarkable staying power and has weathered many a storm. One of the reasons is the note of reality in Paul's mind. He is absolutely sincere. He sees the main thing all the time. His mind is quick and plays with many a turn of expression, but this intellectual byplay is not the key to Paul's mind. That key is Christ and Christ alone. Paul believed that he had dealings directly

with the Risen Christ, the Jesus of Nazareth whom the Jews had crucified. He claimed that he received of the Lord, how the Lord Jesus instituted the supper on the night in which he was betrayed (1 Cor. xi. 23-34). In this exposition Paul gives a non-sacramental interpretation of the supper: "This do in remembrance of me." To make the symbolic meaning beyond controversy, he adds: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (xi. 26). There is no "magic" here. We may set aside as irrelevant the question whether Paul received this direct revelation from the Lord Jesus, as I sincerely believe to be true. The point in dispute is Paul's own interpretation of the ordinance in the non-sacramental sense. This is as plain as a pikestaff. It is quite beside the mark to produce proof of what the Mithraists meant by their baptism and by their suppers. That is eisegesis, not exegesis. Paul is himself the most competent exponent of Paulinism. He is entitled to the canons of criticism applied to Plato or to Shakespeare. Paul was a mystic (cf. Campbell, *Paul the Mystic*, 1907), but he was no raving rhapsodist. This many-sidedness is a peril only to those unable to understand a real man of flesh and blood, this statesman, this tent-maker, this rabbi, this philosopher, this scholar, this orator, this theologian, this missionary, this pastor, this ecclesiastic, this humanitarian, this lover of Jesus Christ, this great Christian freeman.

CHAPTER III

PAUL AND THE DEITY OF CHRIST

The Outlook, of New York, in a very kindly review of my "Divinity of Christ in the Gospel of John," closes with these words: "The thesis to which the Gospel thus leads him up is, 'Jesus is God.' It is certain that Paul, in Epistles of earlier date than the earliest Gospel, and of undisputed authorship, never taught that."

The reviewer admits that John's Gospel does teach that view of Jesus, but pits Paul's Epistles against John's Gospel to the discredit of the Gospel.

Now, if the reviewer means that Paul did not say in so many words, "Jesus is God," he is correct. But neither does John say these words, though he evidently says the thing in substance. John says that the Word was God (John 1:1) and that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us (John 1:14). He makes it perfectly evident that he considers the incarnate Son of God, the eternal Logos. John also represents Thomas as addressing Jesus as "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28).

How is it with Paul? Luke in Acts 20:28 (correct text, margin of Revised Version) reports Paul as saying to the elders of Ephesus at Miletus: "Feed the church of God which he purchased with his own

blood." The two oldest and best Greek manuscripts of the New Testament (Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) read "God" here, not "Lord." But, it may be replied, this is simply Luke's report of Paul's speech.

In Romans 9:5, Paul himself says: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." This is the text of the Revised Version. The old Greek had no punctuation and one is at liberty to make his own punctuation. There is no semicolon after "flesh; he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever. Amen." This is possible to be sure, but nothing like so natural either in the Greek or in the English. Besides, the phrase "Christ as concerning the flesh" clearly suggests Christ not according to the flesh and seems to demand "God" in apposition to complete the sense.

But this is by no means all. The Epistle to Titus is not admitted as Pauline by all scholars, but the balance of evidence still turns that way. In Titus 2:13 we read: "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ" (margin of the Revised Version). The text (R. V.) reads "of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." The papyri and inscriptions furnish abundant proof that the expression "Our great God and Saviour" was a current formula in the worship of the Roman emperor. Paul simply took this formula and applied it to Christ (cf. my *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research,* p. 786; Moulton's *Prolegomena to New Testament Greek,* p. 84).

In Colossians 1:15f. Paul describes Jesus as "the

image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him were all things created," language that reminds one curiously of the opening verse of John's Gospel.

Bacon (*The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate,* p. 7) says: "All of the Logos doctrine but the name is already present in the Pauline Epistles." It is hardly worth while to split hairs over the word "God" when the idea is the same. Besides, as already shown, it is not at all certain that Paul did not apply the word "God" to Jesus. The balance of the evidence in Acts 20:28, Romans 9:5, Titus 2:13 is in favor of that position. Besides, Paul in numerous passages calls Jesus "Lord," a common word for God in the Old Testament and in the Gospels. He also places Jesus on an equality with God in various passages, even in the earliest Epistles, as "in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. 1:1), "peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 1:1), "now our Lord Jesus Christ himself and God our Father" (2 Thess. 2:14), "through Jesus Christ, and God the Father" (Gal. 1:1).

And then in that famous passage, Philippians 2:6-11, Paul expressly asserts the preincarnate state of Christ "in the form of God" "on an equality with God." This great passage affirms the deity of Christ and the humanity of Jesus and the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

"No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:3). The preincarnate riches of Christ Paul asserts in 2 Corinthians 8:9.

This is by no means all that Paul has on this sub-

ject, but it is enough to controvert completely the opinion of *The Outlook* reviewer that "Paul never taught that" (the deity of Jesus Christ), as John's Gospel has it.

The simple truth is that all the New Testament books have the same attitude toward Jesus. Dr. Lukyn Williams has a new and able discussion of Matthew's Gospel under the title, *The Hebrew Christian Messiah,* in which he shows conclusively that the author of the first Gospel presents and proves the deity of Christ.

The same position appears in the so-called Logia (the Q of criticism).

Mark does no other.

Modern criticism has shown that all the sources of our knowledge agree that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

Thus far is my brief reply to *The Outlook* in *The Baptist World* in 1917. But the argument is really stronger than I put it then. One must remember that Paul was a Jew, a Pharisee of the straitest sort, a trained theologian from Gamaliel's school and familiar with all the Jewish antipathy to polytheistic language and emperor worship so rife when he wrote. In applying the term "Lord" [1] to Jesus he was fully aware of the Jewish sensitiveness about the use of that word in the Septuagint for God and also of the free way in which the Romans applied it to "Lord Cæsar." Paul saw the issue clearly drawn between Cæsar and Christ for the Lordship of the world. He boldly challenged the Cæsar cult and championed the worship of Jesus

[1] Κύριος

as Lord. One must bear this in mind in measuring the force of Paul's language. It was not a careless slip on Paul's part, but a deliberate conviction when he placed Jesus on a par with the God and Father of men.

Besides, Paul's faith in Jesus as Lord was the outgrowth of personal experience. When he surrendered to the Risen Jesus on the Damascus road, he asked first: "Who art thou, Lord?" (Acts 9:5, 22:8; 26:15). On learning that it was Jesus whom he was persecuting Paul said: "What shall I do, Lord?" (Acts 22:10.) Paul never wavered from the conviction that he had seen the Risen Jesus who appeared to him also at other times and whom he recognized as "Lord" (Acts 9:10 in Damascus; Acts 22:19 in Jerusalem). From the very first, after Paul's radical conversion that made him turn his back upon all his theological prejudices and self-interest, "he proclaimed Jesus that he is the Son of God" (Acts 9:20), "proving that this is the Christ (Messiah)" (Acts 9:22). Paul had crossed the Rubicon. The Jews in Damascus sought to kill him (Acts 9:23) and Jewish hate sought his life to the end, but Paul never faltered in loyalty to Jesus as Lord.

If it be said that Paul only believed in and taught a practical Trinity and not a metaphysical theory of the Godhead, several things call for remark. One is that Paul knew rabbinical refinements concerning the unity of God and the perils of polytheism. He also knew something of current Greek philosophical speculation. He came from Tarsus which was the home of a great university with famous teachers of philos-

ophy. He argued with the Stoics and Epicureans in the agora of Athens, much to their contempt indeed, for they counted him a mere "seed-collector," [1] a picker-up of scraps of wisdom in the marketplace (Acts 17:18), a mere babbler in the midst of sophists and linguistic gymnasts. But one recalls that Paul's Epistles have so many words in common with the philosophical language of Seneca that scholars have seriously discussed the question whether Paul did not borrow from the great Stoic or he from Paul (Lightfoot's Excursus in his Commentary on Philippians). And Sir W. M. Ramsay dares to say that Paul is the greatest philosopher of all times, greatest in insight, in sanity, in grasp, in knowledge of truth. Besides, Paul's later Epistles (Col., Eph., the Pastorals) reveal a titanic struggle with a subtle phase of philosophy that struck at the Person of Christ. Incipient Gnosticism in the Province of Asia had accepted Christianity, but rejected the Deity and Lordship of Jesus. This esoteric philosophy of the East held that matter was inherently evil and that the good God could not touch matter. Hence it posited a series of *æons* as intermediaries between God and matter. The Person of Christ was solved by them in two ways. One wing held that Jesus did not have a real human body, but only seemed to be a man (Docetic Gnostics). The other wing taught that Jesus was a mere man, but that the Christ (an *æon*) came upon him at his baptism and left him in his death on the Cross (Cerinthian Gnostics). But in both views the Christ was considered

[1] σπερμολόγος

an *æon* or emanation from God. The Gnostics placed Jesus Christ at the bottom of a series of *æons* or emanations of God. Paul challenged this degrading Christology in a masterly argument in which he holds to the unity of Jesus and Christ, "Christ Jesus the Lord" (Col. 2:6), the actual humanity of Jesus Christ "through the blood of the Cross" (Col. 1:20), the real deity of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Son of God, as "the Son of his love" (Col. 1:13), "the image of the invisible God" (1:15), "for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (2:9), and Christ is now "seated on the right hand of God" (3:1). Paul fearlessly claimed primacy for Jesus Christ as "the firstborn of all creation" (1:15), not the end of a series of *æons,* as the Creator and Sustainer of the material universe (1:16-17), as the head of the spiritual universe (1:18), "that in all things he might have the preeminence." The same line of argument is carried out in Ephesians and in the Pastoral Epistles.

It is impossible to say, therefore, that Paul did not grapple with the philosophical and metaphysical aspects of the Trinity and that for him Jesus had only the "value-judgment" of God without any acute reflection of the force of his words. He met and conquered as subtle a form of Christological heresy as Christianity has ever had to meet. He rose in this controversy to the highest heights of appreciation and adoration of Jesus the Son of God, the Preincarnate Son of God (2 Cor. 8:9; Phil. 2:6). He used language of Jesus that is not fit to apply to any mere man, even the noblest of men. He gave Jesus Christ the attributes of God and, in all probability (Acts 20:28; Rom.

9:5; Tit. 2:13), like John's Gospel (1:1), applied the very word "God" to Jesus, whom he certainly called repeatedly "the Son of God."

A vast literature has grown up around the famous passage in Phil. 2:5-11. Here Paul definitely asserts that in Christ's Preincarnate state He was "existing in the form of God."[1] In this state Christ Jesus "counted the being on an equality with God"[2] *as a fact.* First get that clearly. It was a fact, a conscious fact to Christ Jesus before his Incarnation, just as we have it in John 1:1. We need not split hairs over the distinctions between "form"[3] of God (see also "form of a servant"), "likeness of men,"[4] "in fashion as a man."[5] These refinements do not affect the broad statement in the sentence that Jesus in his Preincarnate state was on a par with God just as the Jews accused him of claiming, "making himself equal with God"[6] (John 5:18). The deity which Christ had was just as actual as the humanity which he took upon himself. Whatever is meant by "emptied himself"[7] Paul cannot mean to say that Jesus divested himself of his divine nature and Sonship. That he could not do as no earthly son can rid himself of his father's nature. The thing to which Jesus did not "cling"[8] was his place in heaven beside the Father and on the

---

[1] ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων

[2] ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ

[3] μορφή

[4] ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων

[5] σχήματι ὡς ἄνθρωπος

[6] ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ

[7] ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν

[8] ἁρπαγμόν

Throne of God. He gave up the habiliments of Deity, but not the reality and not the power, though the Incarnation inevitably imposed limitations of time and place and knowledge, and human weariness and weakness to which the Gospels bear ample witness. But in this great passage Paul sets forth in masterly fashion the Deity and the Humanity of Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, with the added glory and honor which came after the Humiliation. The supreme exaltation will be "that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Denney (Letters of Principal Denney to Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, p. 124) objects to the sentence, "Jesus is God," on the ground that in English the word "God" is a personal proper name and does not connote the Greek *theos*. "God" (as Father and Holy Spirit) is more than Jesus and Jesus is human as well as divine. There is point in this linguistic difficulty in the English.

Paul not only took Jesus to be the Son of God and Lord of his own life, but he gloried in the worship and service of Jesus that has been surpassed by no Christian Mystic in all time. Paul sank his very self into the will of Christ: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20).

CHAPTER IV

PAUL NOT A SACRAMENTARIAN

In the very able article of Professor H. T. Andrews in the November *Expositor* on "The Place of the Sacraments in the Teaching of St. Paul" the learned writer, it seems to me, makes the fatal mistake of reading into Paul's language about baptism the ideas of the Mithraists and of the later sacramentarian Christians. This is precisely the vice of the historico-critical method that Professor H. A. A. Kennedy has so skilfully refuted in his *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*. Paul's keen mind was all alert for points of contact with the thought of his time, but he was not a mere blunderer with no coherent theology. Professor Andrews surely overstates the matter when he claims that scientific exegesis has given the victory to the sacramentarians against the symbolists and that theologians must find some way to rescue modern Christianity from this blight or throw Paul overboard as a reliable interpreter of Christianity. He holds rightly that modern Christians as a whole are not going to accept sacramentarian Christianity. Professor Andrews admits that Paul has his evangelical side, but he holds that the inconsistency in his attitude toward baptism is incapable of solution. I venture to reply

that the Professor has himself gotten into the fog instead of Paul.

If one interprets Paul's language about the baptism symbolically there is no inconsistency. The bugle blast of liberty in Galatians against the Judaizing ceremonialists is thus entirely in place when we come to Paul's teaching on baptism. Now there are two passages in Paul's Epistles that to my mind are decisive on this point and render it impossible to class Paul with the sacramentarians on the subject of baptism. The first one is 1 Corinthians 1:14-17. Here Paul expresses gratitude [1] that he baptized none of the Corinthian Christians save Crispus and Gaius. Then he recalls the household of Stephanas and beyond that he cannot recall whether he baptized any others. Certainly this attitude, almost of indifference, is not that of a man who attached saving efficacy to the ordinance of baptism. But verse 17 settles the matter. "For Christ sent me not to baptize [2] but to evangelize,[3] not in wisdom of speech, that the cross of Christ should not be made empty." Here Paul deliberately interprets his permanent mission as an apostle [4] of Christ in language that leaves baptism to one side, and in contrast with his real work of preaching the gospel. I do not see how it is possible to understand that Paul could write thus if he held to baptismal regeneration. Certainly Paul was not

---

[1] εὐχαριστῶ
[2] βαπτίζειν
[3] εὐαγγελίζεσθαι
[4] ἀπέστειλεν

making light of baptism, but he did not consider it his task.

I do not press the last clause where the fear is implied that the cross of Christ may be rendered null and void, emptied[1] of real value. It is possible to confine this clause to the "wisdom of speech," though it naturally points back also to the previous contrast.

The other passage is Romans vi:3-6, where Paul explains the symbolism of baptism in terms of burial and resurrection. Certainly Paul here is a symbolist, as is so beautifully brought out by Sanday and Headlane on this passage.

There are passages in Paul's writings which are capable of the sacramentarian interpretation given to them by Professor Andrews. My contention is that these ambiguous passages should be expounded in the light of Paul's real spirit and not from the standpoint of Mithraism and later sacramentarian Christianity. To do that is not in my opinion scientific exegesis. It rather makes a jumble of Paul, whose insight into the mind of Christ has never been surpassed. It is not necessary to throw Paul overboard.

---

[1] κενωθῇ

CHAPTER V

PAUL AS CHURCH ARCHITECT IN CORINTH

Paul is on the defensive in the first four chapters of First Corinthians. The household of Chloe have come to Ephesus (1 Cor. 1:11) with full reports of the strife in the church in Corinth. There was schism and partisanship. Some stood for Paul, some for Apollos, some for Cephas, and some for Christ (making a partisan use of Christ's name). It was all very humiliating to Paul. It is not certain that Peter had been to Corinth though it is possible. At any rate the Judaizers made use of Peter's name as they had done with that of James, the Lord's brother (Gal. 2:12), in opposition to Paul. Apollos himself had left Corinth because of the disturbance and refused Paul's urgent entreaty to return (1 Cor. 16:12). He had had enough of Corinth. He had gone with cordial recommendations from Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus (Acts 18:27) and his eloquence and learning had made a great impression. He had clearly not meant to cause a schism. But once factions arise in a church over preachers, it is not easy to end the turmoil.

The situation in Corinth must have been very bad, judging from Paul's own language in these chapters and from 2 Corinthians where the climax is reached.

Paul is seeking to show that neither he nor Apollos is to blame for the divisions that have come, but the conceit and jealousy of the members themselves who have not acted in the spirit of Christ (1 Cor. 3:1-9; 4:6-21). Paul planted the seed, and Apollos watered the plant, but God gave the increase (3:6), and God deserves all the glory. Besides, it is "God's field or husbandry" and "God's building" and Paul and Apollos are merely fellow-workers with God in building the house of God (3.9).

It is this figure of "building" that Paul takes up and develops in 3:11-17. In doing so Paul has to justify his work in Corinth, but it makes him feel like a fool for Christ's sake to have to do it (4:10) as he says with the keenest irony: "We are fools for Christ's sake, but ye are wise in Christ."

The word translated "master-builder" is really our word "architect." [1] Dr. Walter Lock, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford University, has an excellent monograph on "St. Paul the Masterbuilder" in which he applies the figure to Paul's whole career. But Paul is here thinking primarily of his work in Corinth as founder and builder of the church there. The pastor is a church architect if he does his work properly. He does not, indeed, build the edifice in which the church meets, though often it is a pity that the preacher has had such a small part in the construction of the house of worship. Church architecture is a fascinating subject. The early Christians had no separate houses of worship. Present church

[1] ἀρχιτέκτων

architecture has developed from the Jewish synagogue and the Greek temple and the Roman basilica. The building is meant for worship and preaching and teaching. The medieval cathedrals were for worship and for impressing the senses, not for preaching. Gothic architecture seems to be an invention of the devil for the prevention of preaching and as such it is a great success. In it one does not get air, heat, or light, and one cannot hear the sermon. The dim religious light suits the deacon's nap and one's æsthetic taste for beauty.

The Greek word for "carpenter" [1] has a wider meaning than our English word. It was applied to workers in stone and brick also. Prof. W. A. Granger [2] argues that we should say "Jesus the Workman" and that Jesus was in actual touch with the wide industrial life of his time. Be that as it may, the word here for "architect" was used for engineers, a director of workmen, any one whose force of intellect is master of an enterprise (cf. our captains of industry). In a papyrus [3] of the third century B. C. we read that "Cleon the architect" had as successor one who had worked under him and he is called "Theodorus the sub-architect." [4]

It is plain that Paul conceives that the pastor of a church is the head builder. He is the leader of the force, the man of vision with plans for the future, who looks at the work as a whole, and puts it through.

---

[1] τέκτων

[2] *The Expositor.*

[3] P. Petr. II, 42 (a). See Moulton and Milligan's Vocabulary.

[4] Θεόδωρον τὸν ὑπαρχιτέκτονα

But it is equally clear that Paul did not try to do all the work. He is the chief workman, the master-workman, the leader of workmen, but he is not the only workman. Some churches have actually regarded the pastor as a hired man to do all the jobs in the church from sexton to sermon, ever to raising his own salary. The pastor who does all the work in the church has done the church a great injury. The wise pastor finds work for every member of the church to do. He sees the angel in the stone and he trains young workmen who can carve the angel out of the stone and who will themselves see angels. The true pastor is a Christian statesman with plans for the Kingdom of God of which his church is a part, a fighting division in the army that is storming the trenches of the enemy.

And Paul is architect of the whole church life. All departments of the church's activities head up in him. There should be no cross-currents, no cross-purposes, no rivals to his leadership. A country can have but one governor at a time. A railroad can have only one president. The local church is a great business enterprise for the spread of the Kingdom of God in a given community and in the whole world. The pastor is leader, but not autocrat. The church is a democracy, a flock, with a leader. They must play the game of follow your leader if they are to win. There should be no organization connected with the church life that regards the pastor as an outsider or as an interloper. The choir centers around the preacher. The committees all head up in him as head of the church work. The deacons work under and with the

pastor. They are his cabinet. The Sunday School is, or should be, merely the church engaged in the work of teaching the Bible and evangelizing the young.

The pastor should be chief of the Sunday School as of the Sunday services and of the prayer meeting. The Sunday School has not yet been properly correlated to the church work in all churches. It began as a parasite outside of the life of the church and a certain amount of suspicion and of independence still exists. The workers in the Sunday School sometimes resent any kind of control by the church or pastor. Many feel that the Sunday School takes the place of the church services. It is a common and a very sad sight to see two-thirds of the Sunday School pupils and teachers go away from church. It is well known that in the "'teen age" a large proportion of the children drop out of the Sunday School. They have not learned the habit of going to church, of public worship of God in the sanctuary. As a result they are a dead loss to the cause of Christ. The day is coming when the pastor may need to be the superintendent of the Sunday School, the Sunday School specialist, and do away with the second morning service, and preach to the young people while he has them together so as to win them to Christ. It is a local problem that each church has to solve in its own way, but the average pastor is not now the architect of the whole church life. The young people often take their meeting in place of the evening church service. Every organization in the church should consider the pastor as actual head and should cooperate with him as leader. The Sunday School

teachers, like the deacons, are part of the pastor's cabinet. The Sunday School should function in harmony with the church and not against it. The young people should work under the pastor's leadership.

Once more, the pastor must build on the right foundation if he is to be a wise architect as Paul claims that he was. Paul had no room for any other foundation [1] than the one on which he built in Corinth and which Apollos added to in his work. Indeed, the Christian can have no other: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). The architect who tries it will find that he has built his house upon the sand instead of upon the rock. It will not stand. One may build an attractive edifice upon the wrong foundation, but it will topple and fall. Nominal Christians have been found who seem ashamed of Christ as the foundation. They find the Cross a stumbling block like the Jews or foolishness like the Greeks. The Sanhedrin rejected this Stone which God made the head of the corner. Jesus called obedience to his words building on the rock. The architect must see to it that Christ is under the life of the church and of each life in the church.

The wise architect, says Paul, will build with the right materials.[1] One may build a poor-house on the right foundation. The house may fall though the foundation stands. Paul warns each one in Corinth how he builds [2] on the foundation of Christ. The day

---

[1] *Θεμέλιον ἔθηκα* (3:10). Same root in both words.

[2] *ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον*. Note double use of *ἐπί*.

of testing comes for every house, even fire-proof buildings. The fire comes and then it will be shown of what sort the house is, whether wood, hay, stubble, gold, silver, precious stones. "Inflammable" is written on some of the freight cars that one sees. Paul has in mind the life-work of the Christian teacher or preacher. It may go up in smoke like chaff while the man himself will be saved, but so as by fire (3:15). This does not mean purgatory for the preacher, but Paul means that the preacher or teacher himself may get to heaven, but empty-handed. He bears no sheaves with him. His work has been for naught. Some teaching, not to say preaching, is dry enough to burn with ease, almost by spontaneous combustion. But such a ministry is a tragedy of failure.

But Paul pictures something still worse. He warns the schismatics in Corinth against the peril of destroying a church of God (3:16-17). That is a terrible thing to do, to be a church-wrecker. For the church, like the individual soul, is the real temple of God. The Spirit of God dwells in the hearts of his people. The preacher who wrecks churches like a tornado is a terror, but God will destroy him. It is not clear what Paul means by "destroy." [1] He uses the same word for the church that he destroys and for his own destruction. The church of God's people in any place is a holy thing and God's wrath rests upon him who ruins it.

Paul did not succeed in Corinth without difficulty. He began his work there with no support save the

---

[1] φθείρω

fellowship of Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:1-4). He supported himself by his trade and received occasional aid from Philippi and Thessalonica (Acts 18:5; 1 Thess. 3:6; Phil. 4:15). In fact, Paul refused help from Corinth and "robbed other churches, taking wages of them that I might minister unto you" (2 Cor. 11:8) and kept himself thus from being a burden to the Corinthians (2 Cor. 11:9) because of the critical spirit of some of them who actually accused Paul of preaching for money (2 Cor. 12:14). After Paul left Corinth every conceivable charge that malignant hate could contrive was raised against him by the hostile minority there. Paul answers their charges *seriatim* and with biting sarcasm and withering scorn in 2 Cor. 10:1-13:10. He had written several letters to the church. He had sent Timothy who was apparently ineffective against the rampant Judaizers (1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10-11); they had scouted his youth and inexperience and frightened him back to Ephesus (Acts 19:22). Paul had sent Titus who had a stouter spirit and who brought him in Macedonia a glorious report of victory by the majority in Corinth that deeply stirred Paul to appreciation (2 Cor. 1:12-3:3; 6:11-7:16). Titus had filled Paul's heart with praise, but Paul now attempts to win the stubborn minority by a powerful rebuttal of their charges (2 Cor. 10-13). He calls these Judaizers in Corinth "false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ," ministers of Satan (2 Cor. 11:13-14) who "desire an occasion" and so manufacture slanders against Paul to carry their point against him (2 Cor. 11:12). Paul sent Titus back with this great apology

and to finish the collection there (2 Cor. 8-9) and waited awhile for the work to be done, apparently going round about to Illyricum (Rom. 15:19). When he came again to Corinth, the opposition had disappeared and the Judaizers had left the field to Paul (Acts 20:1-3). He met trouble again from the Jews in Corinth as at the first (Acts 18). Paul did not always fight trouble to a finish. Sometimes he left when no issue was at stake or when it seemed best all round as in Antioch in Pisidia, in Lystra, in Philippi, in Thessalonica, in Athens. But in Corinth he carried on the fight because the very essence of the gospel was at stake as in Galatia. The Judaizers were subverting the freedom of the gospel of grace in Christ. Paul kept away from Corinth till peace had come, but he fought the fight for spiritual liberty to victory, not for personal vindication. He cared naught for a personal triumph. So he was a wise church architect in Corinth and a model for ministers to-day who have to build a church of God in worldly and wicked cities like Corinth where luxury and vice combine with worldliness and heresy to set at naught the message of Christ and the ministers of God.

CHAPTER VI

PAUL'S ECCLESIASTICAL INDEPENDENCE

It may seem a bit ungracious and unsympathetic with the rather strenuous efforts to bring about organic union to-day to cite the conduct of Paul in defence of his own ecclesiastical independence. But the time has come, I think, for looking at facts as they are with calmness and balanced judgment. Every right-minded Christian would prefer union as well as unity in the body of Christ (both the local church and the Kingdom of God). Unity does not always exist where there is union. Many a local church is torn by dissension that does not lead to actual schism. Sometimes in such cases the actual schism seems to be the only way to secure unity of spirit that does come later.

Certainly disunion is not to be sought as an end in itself, unless it is the expression of normal diversity and growth. The simplest form of reproduction is by cellular fissure. Paul justified diversities of gifts in the body of Christ as seen in the church in Corinth (1 Cor. 12:4-11). The same Spirit bestowed these varied gifts for the development of the body as a whole and for the richer functioning of the body. Diversity is a sign of life. Only no one part must try to lord it over the rest, "that there should be no

schism in the body" (12:25). This is precisely the peril in a democracy like a local church. It is the glory of the democracy that each member can be heard as in the assembly in Athens. But the peril of the democracy is the demagogue. The religious demagogue is, if possible, the worst of all. So Paul proceeds to warn the church in Corinth against disorder and disaster (1 Cor. 14) after the wondrous picture of the working of love that tempers the spirit and brings harmony out of chaos (1 Cor. 13).

Now, when Jesus made his Intercessory Prayer in which he prayed earnestly for oneness among the apostles and among all future disciples (John 17), he had that very night previously rebuked the apostles for unseemly strife in struggling like heathen for the posts of honor at the table (Luke 22:24-30). The strife continued after the Passover meal had begun so that Jesus had to rebuke the apostles by the object lesson of washing their feet with a pointed interpretation (John 13:1-16). On two previous occasions the apostles had caused anguish of heart to Christ by their disputes as to which of them was the greatest. It is clear, therefore, that Jesus had this unseemly lack of unity in mind most of all in his prayer. There was already organic union, but a lamentable want of unity. Certainly Christ desired and desires the fullest harmony and unity among his followers. That goal is only possible by complete conformity to the will of Christ.

Already in the New Testament we discern types of teaching that come into conflict. These differences in doctrine vary in degree and in value. Each of the

great writers has his own standpoint and the world is the richer for the interpretation of Christ by a Peter, a Mark, a Matthew, a Luke, a John, a James, a Paul, a Jude, an Apollos. At times these men did not see everything alike as at Antioch where Peter and Barnabas left Paul alone for a while. But the theological differences were fought out and reconciliation came as the result of frank discussion and mutual understanding. No actual cleavage in doctrine came, no schism in the body of Christ.

But it was different in Paul's controversy with the Judaizers and later with the Gnostics. In both these instances Paul cared more for loyalty to Christ and to truth than for organic union. In the case of the Judaizers Paul felt that the very heart of the gospel was at stake. This party of the circumcision, more Pharisaic than Christian, had its headquarters at Jerusalem. They were unwilling for the Gentiles to become Christians unless they also became Jews. Peter was actually brought by them before the church in Jerusalem for his conduct in Cæsarea when he entered into the house of Cornelius and had the household baptized on their conversion without making them Jews (Acts 10:1-11:18). The formal campaign of Paul and Barnabas to win the Gentiles stirred the Pharisaic party, the Judaizers, to challenge this whole program. They insisted in Antioch and later in Jerusalem that the Gentiles must become Jews (Acts 15:1-5). But Paul fought this heresy vehemently and in the end, successfully. He called it "no gospel at all" and pronounced an anathema on all who preached it (Gal. 1:6-10). He argued for freedom of the Gentiles from

this yoke of bondage (Gal. 5:1-15). Paul defied these "false apostles" who preached "another Jesus" and "a different gospel" (2 Cor. 11:1-15). He will not surrender one whit to "the false brethren" "who came in to spy out our liberty in Christ" in the case of Titus in Jerusalem at the Conference "that the truth of the gospel might continue with you" (Gal. 2:3-5). He will not surrender to the Judaizers in Corinth, but threatens them with excommunication unless they submit (2 Cor. 13).

Paul is equally as positive in his opposition to the Gnostics, both Docetic and Cerinthian, who offered a degrading view of Christ as a subordinate *æon* or emanation from God and not on a par with God in nature and power. If Galatians is a trumpet blast against the Judaizers, Colossians is a thunderbolt against the Gnostics. Paul boldly asserts the equality of Christ with God as his Son in his image, as supreme in the work of the creation of the material universe and in the spiritual realm (Col. 1:13-18), "for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9). "This I say, that no one may delude you with persuasiveness of speech" (Col. 2:4). The Pastoral Epistles show the same concern against the heresy. Paul did not fight in vain for the Supremacy of Christ. In time the Gnostics sloughed off. "They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but *they went out,* that they might be made manifest that they all are not of us" (1 John 2:19). This is the verdict of John and the verdict of history.

It is plain, therefore, that Paul did not consider

peace the most important thing. He was not for peace at any price, not at the price of loyalty to Christ and to truth. He would not cover up vital error for the sake of apparent harmony. He would not compromise essential truth with real heresy for the sake of mere formal union. Least of all would he submit to compulsory conformity to what he considered error. He gloried in his freedom in Christ. And Paul wanted all to enjoy the same liberty in Christ that he claimed for himself. Paul is the great protagonist of religious liberty for all races, sexes, classes. "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28).

But Paul's ecclesiastical independence has a wider reach than the struggle with heretics like the Judaizers and the Gnostics. Paul asserted and gloried in his independence of the Twelve Apostles. The Judaizers charged that Paul was not one of the Twelve and was not on a par with them. This they did to flout his influence with the Gentile Christians and to wean them away from Paul. Their argument assumed that the Twelve agreed with them and not with Paul. We have Paul's own defense in Galatians 1 and 2. Not only is the fact admitted there he is not one of the Twelve, but he glories in his ecclesiastical independence of any man or group of men (Gal. 1:1, 11-12): "Paul, an apostle (not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead):" "For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ." Paul did

not obtain his apostolic commission or message from the Twelve or from any man. In fact, there is not the slightest evidence that Paul received ordination at all. The incident in Acts 13:1-3 comes after Paul had been long at work in the ministry and is apparently only a farewell service for the missionaries, Barnabas and Saul, before they start. Paul goes on to show that after his conversion and call he did not go to Jerusalem to consult the apostles before him, but to Arabia (Gal. 1:16-17). After three years he did make a visit of fifteen days to Jerusalem to visit Cephas and also James the Lord's brother (Gal. 1:18-19). It was fourteen years before he again came in touch with the Jerusalem apostles in a private conference in Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10), probably in between the first explosion at Jerusalem (Acts 15:5) and the gathering next day when the victory of Paul and Barnabas was won (Acts 15:6-29). Scholars are not agreed as to the time of the visit in Gal. 2:1-10 and it is not pertinent to the argument here. The point is that the interview of which Paul tells in Gal. 2:1-10, apparently first in public "before them" (2:2) and then "privately before them who were of repute," led to the frank and full recognition by Cephas, James, and John, the Jerusalem "pillars," that Paul and Barnabas were their equals in rank and authority and power. The Jerusalem apostles were to be leaders in the work among the Jews while Paul and Barnabas were to be leaders in the work among the Gentiles. But Paul bluntly says: "They, I say, who were of repute imparted nothing to me" (Gal. 2:6).

In the face of the strong language employed by Paul

it is impossible to find the slightest ecclesiastical tie between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles. There was agreement and spiritual unity, but absolute independence. The Jerusalem pillars lined up with Paul and Barnabas and not with the Judaizers. But Paul claimed victory for the Gentile Christians as well as the maintenance of his own ecclesiastical independence. That victory is rendered all the more complete if the words "and from things strangled" (Acts 15:29) are not genuine. The example of Paul should make us all pause before we push matters to an extreme in efforts to bring about compulsory union. For one thing, it is sure to fail. The Roman Catholic Pontiff has already firmly announced that he will discuss the reunion of Christendom on only one basis, absolute surrender to Rome. We know, then, of a certainty, that organic union cannot come to pass on that platform. The whole thing becomes chimerical. The matter resolves itself to this. Those who prefer union to anything else can have it for themselves by following Newman to Rome. But they must know that they cannot carry the non-Roman world with them. No amount of persuasion or of pressure can turn the clock back to the pre-Reformation period.

And among non-Roman Christians differences exist of too great a nature to force conformity.

The episcopacy is one of them. Bishop Lightfoot proved that in the New Testament the terms bishop and elder were employed in the same sense. The modern use of "bishop" appears in the Epistles of Ignatius, but not in the New Testament. One has only to look at Acts 20:17, 28 where "elders" and "bishops"

describe the same persons to see the point. We see the same thing in Tit. 1:5, 7. Dean Headlam has recently come to the same conclusion as Lightfoot. The only way to reunite the non-Roman world on the basis of the historic episcopate is to convince the non-episcopal bodies that the New Testament ministry is not adequate for present-day needs. One may pursue that line of argument, if he will, but he will make no headway denouncing those who are satisfied with the simplicity and sufficiency of the New Testament ministry. Progress can only be made here by frank recognition of the liberties of all and the rights of those who do not desire ecclesiastical overlords. If organic union were ever again achieved on this basis, how long would it last? Who can guarantee that the New Testament itself may not keep on reproducing the very type of ecclesiastical independence of which Paul is so powerful an exponent?

Another line of cleavage is concerned with sacramental salvation. The effort of sacramentalists to compel non-sacramentalists to give up the purely spiritual interpretation of salvation by grace apart from ceremonialism is doomed to failure. Justification by faith cannot be killed so long as the New Testament is open. On the other hand the non-ceremonialists seem equally unable to convince the sacramentalists to give up insistence upon the ordinances as means of salvation and to accept them as symbols of saving grace already experienced.

Let Paul teach us all patience and forbearance and the meaning of real freedom in Christ. There is

variety in nature and in grace. We can learn to live and to let live. Any effort by any type of Christianity to force its view on the others is resented. This does not mean that one view is as good as another. But it does mean that, the human mind being as it is, we must be content for some men to see things differently. It has been a hard fight to keep the Bible open and free. It is hard also to keep the mind open to the truth. It is still harder to keep the conscience in good working order. But, given the open Bible, the open mind, and the honest conscience, then the result must be left to God and to the individual. Each has the right to preach and to propagate his view of God and Christ. History, heredity, environment, the personal equation, the experience of grace, and the guidance of the Spirit of God determine the outcome. Meanwhile we can learn to love each other heartily in spite of our differences, even because of them. What a dull world it would be if we were all precisely alike!

CHAPTER VII

PAUL AND PATRIOTISM

I

Patriotism and piety are apparently placed in opposition in some countries by the issues of the present world-war. One of the first fulminations was the declaration of a large group of the foremost scholars and theologians of Germany justifying the conduct of the Fatherland in Belgium and in France. British scholars and theologians were quick to reply in a spirit of holy horror at the apparent blindness of the German group to the moral and spiritual issues of the war. The republic of letters was torn asunder, and the kingdom of God seemed rent in twain. Protestants have risen against Protestants, Roman Catholics against Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics against Greek Catholics, Mohammedans against Mohammedans, Jews against Jews. Kings have dragged their peoples into war. Neutral nations have been driven into the war in self-defense. In each case citizenship rises above religion, or at any rate the Christian citizen is compelled to be loyal to the position of his own country or be guilty of treason. The issue raised is one of tremendous import, and is intensely vital now in the United States, as our own country has entered upon

war with Germany. We have millions of men of German birth or descent who must decide what they are to do. There is but one thing to do: to be loyal to the land of adoption. So real Americans all feel. So the great mass of the German-Americans feel, and will act. They are now Americans, not German-Americans.

The case of Paul is worth our study in the present situation. He was caught in the maelstrom of world politics; for Rome, like the United States, was the melting-pot of the nations, though not in quite the same sense. Racial and national characteristics persisted with considerable tenacity in the various provinces of the Roman Empire, which in Asia Minor paid little attention to the old boundaries. The old names for the peoples held on, so that Galatia, for instance, meant either the great Roman province or the old Celtic people in North Galatia. Paul was at once a Jew, a Tarsian, a Greek, a Roman, and soon a Christian. He was true to the best things in these elements, however contradictory they seemed at times. The terms and the concepts designated by them overlapped in various ways, and were not mutually exclusive.

II

Paul appears first as a brilliant young Jewish rabbi, a graduate of the school of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, pleased at the stoning of Stephen by the Sanhedrin, and soon the leader in the first general persecution of the Christians by the Jews. Racial and religious motives are undoubtedly mixed in him, as he presses the

persecution with zeal and success, dragging men and women from their homes to prison and to death with shameless ruthlessness, for no other crime than that of believing in Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. Paul's very breath came to be threat and slaughter, his taste for blood, as always, growing by what it fed on. His conversion stopped his career as a persecutor; but he was always a Jew, was proud of his people and his tribe, gloried in their wonderful history, and cherished their noblest hopes and aspirations (cf. Acts 22:3; 26:3-7; 2 Cor. 11:22; Gal. 1:13f.; Rom. 9:1-5; Phil. 3:4-6). To be sure, relatively in comparison with Christ all this pride of race seemed mere refuse (Phil. 3:7ff.). With Paul, Christ is supreme, and rules even in the sphere of race and politics. Paul had been "exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers" (Gal. 1:14), and never ceased to love the Jews, even when they persecuted him bitterly. As a Pharisee he shared their political conception of the Messianic kingdom as a great Jewish empire which was to drive Rome out of Palestine and dominate the earth, a Pan-Jewish propaganda. Paul remained a Pharisee in many things, particularly in the belief in the bodily resurrection (Acts 23:6), though, as a Christian, he perceived the spiritual nature of the kingdom of God in Christ. This he conceived to be the true Israel, the spiritual Israel, the children of faith, both Jews and Gentiles, gathered from every land on earth (Rom. 3:6, 28; 9:6ff.). Paul held that he was interpreting the true Judaism to the Jews in the cosmopolitan view of the promise to Abraham and the destiny of his people. He rises to the very height of

patriotism in these words: "For I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh; who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever" (Rom. 9:3-5).

It is not easy to define patriotism, for it is more than mere love of the land of one's birth or of his citizenship. It is that, but it broadens out into the love of one's people wherever found, as Japanese love Japanese; Chinese, Chinese; Germans, Germans; Jews, Jews. The Jews had at this time lost their independence, though many of them still lived in Palestine under Roman rule. But many millions more dwelt in the Diaspora. Some of these fell much under the spell of the Græco-Roman civilization, and gave up many of their Jewish customs and views. But Paul was not Hellenized, though a Hellenistic Jew with Aramæan traditions. We see in Paul the struggle of the cultured Jew, loyal to his faith and people, to adapt himself to the world conditions in which he found himself, and to be a loyal Roman citizen.

But Paul was "born in Tarsus of Cilicia," "a citizen of no mean city" (Acts 21:39; 22:3). He had a modern man's pride in the city of his birth and residence. In his "Cities of St. Paul," Ramsay gives ample reasons that justify Paul's praise of Tarsus:

> It was one of the great cities of the Roman world, a Greek city where the Orient met the West, the seat of a great university, the home of philosophy, the meeting place of many cults,

a town where Jews had a strong foothold. He was glad to be known as Saul of Tarsus, a Jewish citizen of this great city. Paul never forgot that he was a Jew, though always the educated Jew, trained to life as a Roman citizen in the most aristocratic position among the population of the great Hellenized, yet more than half Asiatic, city of Tarsus.[1]

Paul "was brought up to a certain stage at Tarsus in the fashion needed for a Jewish boy who was born in the local aristocracy as a Roman citizen and a burgess of Tarsus." [2] He may have attended the University of Tarsus, and, after entering Gamaliel's school in Jerusalem, he probably spent his holidays at home like a modern college-student. Tarsus undoubtedly left its impress on Paul, and made him more than a narrow Palestinian Jew. Probably most men to-day love the towns where they live, whatever their race may be. This is the least of the problems of patriotism.

But Paul was a Hellenist, though not a Hellene or a Hellenizer. Being a Jew, he could not be a Greek by birth. Being a loyal Jew, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, he would not be a Greek in religion and custom. And yet nothing is more certain than that Hellenism made its appeal to Paul's intellectual nature. He spoke and wrote the *Koinè*, the current Greek, with power, as well as the Aramaic (called "Hebrew" in Acts 22:2). He shows points of contact with Greek thought in various ways. He was able to speak with the Stoics and the Epicureans in Athens, and used many of the Stoic terms in his Epistles, and quoted

[1] Ramsay, *Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, page 48.

[2] *Ibid.*, page 43.

from three of the Greek writers. "Previous comparisons have not sufficiently appreciated that which may be stated in one word as Paul's Hellenism." [1] Indeed, one of the modern interpretations of Paul's theology is that he derived much of it from the Greek Mystery-Religions. That is not true, but Paul certainly knew the dialect of the initiates in those mystic cults, and knew how to answer them, and to turn their terms to the service of Christ.[2]

III

Beyond a doubt, Paul is a citizen of the world, a true cosmopolite, and not a narrow Palestinian Jew or a mere provincial Cilician. His patriotism must be interpreted in terms of world-sympathy, not of world-power. He does not wish the Jews to conquer Rome as they tried to do in 66-70 A.D. and failed.

But Paul is a Roman citizen with full privileges and prerogatives. Roman citizenship was a prize that was not open to all. There were more non-citizens than citizens in the Roman Empire; probably more slaves than citizens. Claudius Lysias bought it "with a great sum" (Acts 22:28); but Paul proudly said: "But I am a Roman born." The man who could say *Sum Romanus* felt an instinctive superiority over others who did not possess this advantage. We know that Paul appealed to his rights as a Roman citizen in other emergencies, as in Philippi (Acts

---

[1] Johannes Weiss, *Paul and Jesus,* pages 59f.

[2] Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions.*

16:37) and in Cæsarea (25:11f.). What was Paul's attitude toward the Roman government after Roman magistrates and officers, finally including the Emperor himself, became hostile to him? It is as a Roman citizen that we touch the side of Paul's life that is more nearly parallel to our modern idea of patriotism in an American, British, or German citizen. Roman officers were not all unkind to Paul. Gallio practically gave a decision in Paul's favor, and recognized Christianity as a form of Judaism and so a *religio licita* (Acts 18:14-16). The Asiarchs of Ephesus were friendly to Paul (19:31). Sergius Paulus, Proconsul of Cyprus, was a convert under Paul's preaching (13:12). Julius the Centurion treated Paul kindly (27:3). Even Nero, during Paul's first Roman imprisonment, probably finally dismissed the case for lack of evidence without a formal trial. Certainly the Prefect Burrhus or the Stratopedarch to whom Paul was delivered in Rome gave him a great deal of liberty (28:30f.). But Paul was mistreated by the city officials in Antioch in Pisidia (Act 13:50), in Iconium (14:5), in Philippi (16:22), in Thessalonica (17:6-9), where Paul and his followers were accused of acting contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, as in Philippi he was charged with introducing Jewish customs which Romans were not allowed to receive. The duplicity of Felix and Festus was hard to bear (Acts 24-26). Thus early in Paul's ministry he saw the shadow of the Man of Sin who set himself up as God to be worshiped (2 Thess. 2:3f.). The Emperor-cult was the chief religion of the Roman Empire, and Paul was bound as a preacher of the gospel to meet it in an acute form. But the point

to note just here is that Paul did not allow the injustice done him and Christianity as represented by him to pervert his views of government as an ordinance of God, or to make an anarchist out of him. Paul was a rebel against all wrong. He hesitated not to show the injustice of rulers when it was necessary (Acts 16:37; 25:10f.). No abler champion of human liberty has ever lived than Paul. "For freedom did Christ set us free" (Gal. 5:1). "For ye, brethren, were called for freedom" (5:13). These words are as pertinent for political freedom in Russia and Germany as for religious liberty. It is sometimes said that Paul's words in Roman 13:1-7 were written during the Golden Quinquennium of Nero. That is true, but Paul's words here are quite independent of the personal character of Nero. "The powers that be are ordained of God." They derive their power from God, but not by "divine right of kings." *Vox populi vox dei* in this case. The people have the right to rule from God. "Rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil." This is the ideal, and is not a picture of Romanoffs, Hapsburgs, Hohenzollerns, or police grafters in New York or Chicago. "He is a minister of God to thee for good." "They are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing." Here Paul sketches in broad outline the functions of civic rulers, whether mayors, governors, presidents, or kings. If they had always lived up to this ideal, there would certainly have been fewer wars between nations and rebellions against rulers. Nations, as a rule, do not rush into wars of conquest. They are led on or driven on by rapacious

rulers who misuse their power for personal aggrandizement or wild schemes of empire. Paul is a staunch supporter of law and order, including taxes. To be sure, he is no blind standpatter or reactionary. He is not, like Seneca, the apologist of Nero. He was the first champion of the emancipation of slaves, and urged Philemon to set free and treat as a brother in Christ Onesimus, his converted runaway slave whom Paul returned to him (Philemon 14-21). He urged the Christian slaves to bear their lot with Christian fortitude, but announced a doctrine which was the death knell of human slavery: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). Paul preached the brotherhood of man to a world of slaves. He, more than Tom Paine and Voltaire, proclaimed the rights of man and the world as his country.

But did not Paul become embittered toward Nero and the Roman government after Nero began his fierce persecution of the Christians? Unless we follow the Pastoral Epistles, we have little to guide us in answering this query. I think that they are genuine, and so have no hesitation in appealing to them for witness. After Nero had charged Christians with burning Rome, and was burning them and feeding them to the lions and tigers, Paul wrote: "I exhort therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men; for kings and all men that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity" (1 Tim. 2:1f.). Here the purpose of

government is clearly presented. Paul is still a loyal Roman citizen, in spite of Nero. At the end, when the first stage of the last trial made it plain what the outcome would be, Paul has no bitter word for Nero, unless he called him "the lion" (2 Tim. 4:17), as is not likely. He probably refers to Nero's failure to give him to the lions, which he had escaped as a Roman citizen. Would Paul have responded to the call of Rome to fight? That would depend on the issue. He would have opposed a war of conquest and pillage. Most of the soldiers were mercenaries anyhow. They were hired to fight, and did not always express national convictions or the will of the people. In a war of defense, Paul would have been ready to "do his bit," I believe. He spoke kindly of soldiers, and used them as illustrations of service for Christ. "Suffer hardship with me as a good soldier of Christ Jesus. No soldier on service entangleth himself in the affairs of this life; that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier" (2 Tim. 2:3f.).

IV

And Paul was most of all a Christian. We may be sure that with Paul Christ was Lord and Master. He would not subordinate service to Christ to Cæsar, let alone to Greek philosophy, to Tarsus, or to Judaism. Paul saw the issue coming between Christ and Cæsar. The papyri and inscriptions give abundant evidence of the use of the phrase "Lord Cæsar." We know that the offer of life was made to Polycarp if he would only say, "Lord Cæsar"; but he steadily refused, and said, "Lord Jesus." So he went to death rather

than recant. We know how Paul felt about it. "No one can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:3). This was the spirit of the martyrs who were slain for the word of God (Rev. 6:9) at the hand of Roman emperors. Paul met that fate at the hand of Nero rather than renounce the Lord Jesus. Ten thousand Chinese Christians laid down their lives at the feet of Jesus rather than renounce him at the demand of the Boxer leaders and the Empress Dowager. So then, with Paul patriotism is not the highest virtue, though it is very high. Loyalty to one's land is secondary to loyalty to one's God. To be sure, it is high treason or rebellion to refuse to obey the command of one's government. One who takes that position must be willing to pay the price. That price is one's life. But the price is not too high when the alternative is to disobey the clear will of God. "But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard" (Acts 4:19f.). No Christian should have blind patriotism. Christ is above Cæsar. This does not mean that the Church is above the State. Christ is more than the State, more than the Church. One of the blessings of free government, of the people, by the people, for the people, is precisely this: that the alternative between Christ and the State is avoided. Certainly, if there is a solid body of Christian citizens in a free commonwealth, it will be avoided. The men who are citizens of heaven, a colony of heaven on earth (Phil. 3:20), will not so far forget themselves as to rush

into war contrary to the clear spirit of Christ. Christian citizens, if allowed to rule, wish peace if it is possible to have it and be true to other high obligations (Rom. 12:18). But Paul was not a peace-at-any-price man. His teaching justifies the "League to Enforce Peace." His gospel is the gospel of courage that calls upon all soldiers of Christ to put on the panoply of God, and to withstand in the evil day against the world-rulers of this darkness (Eph. 6:10-16).

CHAPTER VIII

PAUL'S MISSIONARY STATESMANSHIP

The marvel of Paul is that, after these nineteen centuries of Christian history, he is still pre-eminent, next to the Lord Jesus himself, in all matters concerning the principles of Christianity. Aristotle still reigns in the rules of thought, for he practised both the inductive and the deductive methods of reasoning. Ramsay has a masterful chapter on "The Statesmanship of Paul" (pp. 49-100) in his *Pauline and Other Studies* in which he concentrates "attention on the work of Paul as a social influence on the Roman world" (p. 50). Paul was a negligible quantity in the imperial policy of the Cæsars and in the social philosophy of Seneca. But influence is not a matter of reputation. Power is gauged by the forces released that energize life and mould destiny whatever the superficial opinion of the moment may be. We are not to think that Paul deliberately planned to cooperate with Cæsar and Seneca in the social rejuvenation of the Empire. But one can get the right perspective at this distance. Ramsay has a pertinent paragraph: "Of all the men of the first century, incomparably the most influential was the apostle Paul. No other man exercised anything like so much power as he did in moulding the future of the Empire.

Among the Imperial ministers of the period there appeared none that had any claim to the name of statesman except Seneca; and Seneca fell as far short of Paul in practical influence and intellectual insight as he did in moral character."

A good deal can be said for the position of Paul as a great reconstructive force in the life of the Roman Empire. He worked along the lines that tended toward the uplift of the masses and the unity of sentiment that made for strength and the highest development of the Empire. Paul stood for the spiritual principle in religion and showed how Jew and Greek could work together in one spiritual commonwealth of freedom and progress. This spiritual commonwealth of Paul gave hope to Roman life. He combined in himself Jew, Greek, and Christian. He gave the Roman Empire the religious bond that held it together. So Ramsay sums up his case for the supreme statesmanship of Paul. "Had it not been for Paul—if one may guess at what might have been—no man would now remember Roman and Greek civilization. Barbarism proved too powerful for the Græco-Roman civilization unaided by the new religious bond; and every channel through which that civilization was preserved, or interest in it maintained, either is now or has been in some essential part of its course Christian after the Pauline form." Startling as this conclusion is one must admit the force of its appeal to facts.

But all that lay rather in the realm of the unconscious greatness of Paul's career. He was not by profession a statesman in the political sphere, though

Paul was proud of his Roman citizenship and taught obedience to the laws of the Empire (Rom. 13:1-7). Paul was at times apprehensive of a conflict between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdom of Cæsar, for he saw in the Emperor worship the worship of a man in the place of God (2 Thess. 2:3-10). In Thessalonica he had probably drawn the picture of the man of sin who set himself up in the place of God and as a rival to Jesus as Lord. In Thessalonica Paul was accused by the Jews of "saying that there is another king, *one* Jesus" (Acts 17:7). What is certain is that Paul longed to spread the Kingdom of Christ throughout the Roman Empire. The imperialism of Rome gave Paul a vision of the imperialism of Christ. So he early began to plan to capture the Empire for Christ, province by province. By and by Rome enters into his definite plans: "Paul purposed in spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, "After I have been there, I must also see Rome" (Acts 19:21). This is while Paul is in Ephesus where he spent three years during the third missionary campaign. The work in Ephesus was heavy and spread through the province of Asia (Acts 19:14). There were troubles in Corinth with which church Paul was in constant communication by messenger and letter. Timothy had just returned and had been sent on to Macedonia while Titus was still absent in Corinth. But Paul is conducting a great collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem from the churches in Asia, Galatia, Achaia, and Macedonia. The shadow of a schism between Jewish and Gentile Christianity was on the horizon because

of the activity of the Judaizers. Paul hoped to avert this peril to the cause of Christ by the mollifying influence of the collection and by the effect of his presence in Jerusalem with James as the Jerusalem Conference had averted it once before. But Paul's eye is on Rome at the same time. He wishes to use Rome as a platform for proclaiming the gospel to all the world. He had often planned to go to Rome (Rom. 1:13). But Paul sees Spain beyond Rome as a goal for the gospel (Rom. 15:24, 28). The plan to go to Rome became a master passion of his life. It was carried out as part of Christ's plan for Paul in spite of every obstacle (Acts 23:11; 27:24; 28:14). So then we see that Paul was a missionary statesman with a statesman's grasp of his problem. He worked each field as if that were all that was to be done, and yet all the time he kept his eye on the wider outlook of the Kingdom of God and related the particular to the general, the part to the whole.

Paul had a high opinion of the dignity of his task. He felt himself an apostle on a par with the Twelve Apostles. He had received his commission directly from Jesus and not from any man. He was the chosen vessel of Christ to carry the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 9:15; 26:17-20). Paul was proud of this special charge to win the Gentiles to Christ (Gal. 2:9; Eph. 3:1): "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, was this grace given, to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ" (Eph. 3:8). This was Paul's special sphere of service (Rom. 15:16-18), "making it my aim so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named, that I might

not build upon another man's foundation" (Rom. 15:20). Paul looked upon himself as the ambassador of God to the world in behalf of Christ (2 Cor. 5:20). He was heaven's commissioner to earth to treat of peace. He was on a par with kings and potentates. Paul was afraid of no man. The ambassador must be *persona grata* in two circles, the government that he represented and that to which he goes. Paul had power with Christ at the throne of God. He won power for Christ wherever he went. He did not, when in Rome, do as Rome did. The rather in Rome he felt himself a citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven whence he waited for the Lord Jesus Christ (Phil. 3:20). But Paul had no apology to offer anywhere for his service for Jesus Christ.

Paul had passionate loyalty to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. We do not here give the proof that Paul worshipped Jesus as the Second Person in the Trinity. But no one can understand Paul who fails to see that he went far beyond a metaphysical theory of the Trinity. Jesus was the passion of his life (Phil. 1:21) and to know Christ in his power and glory was the goal of his ambition (Phil. 3:10-14). He had no doubt about the correctness of his "understanding in the mystery of Christ" (Eph. 3:4), though the love of Christ passes all knowledge (Eph. 3:18). Paul had small patience with the shallow mind that imagined it had pierced the depths of the wisdom and the knowledge of God (Rom. 11:33-36). But he could not doubt the reality of the mastery of his own life by Christ that made his will subservient to that of Christ (Gal. 2:20; 2 Cor. 10:5). It is

clear that Paul made Christ central in his theology and in his preaching as Lord of all creation, of life and death, the hope of eternal life, the Saviour from sin, the Crucified and Risen Lord (1 Cor. 1:17; 2:2; Gal. 6:14; Col. 1:13-22; 1 Cor. 15:3-9; 2 Cor. 5:14-19; 1 Tim. 2:5). Paul could not have written of a mere man what he has written in Phil. 2:85-11. The love that Christ has for Paul and for all men is the regulating force of his life. It holds him together[1] (2 Cor. 5:14) and keeps him to his task when tempted to give it up. Every missionary needs this overpowering experience of Christ's love for sinners that will keep him on the track in the midst of an unsympathetic environment when men clamor for philosophy, culture, new thought, the old ethnic faiths, social service as a substitute for Christ. Nowhere is the Cross of Christ so imperative as in the missionary's life and preaching. Without this he will have no message and no mission. He will have no power and his ministry will be barren of results. With Paul Christianity was not a mere phase of religious thought in the current thought-forms of the first century A. D. to give way ere long to other developments of the religious interest or to new discoveries in science and philosophy. With Paul Jesus Christ is the mystery of God revealed at last in the Incarnation and the Cross and the Resurrection and the climax of God's own wisdom, the perpetual challenge of the human intellect and the joy of the soul of man (1 Cor. 2:6-10; Rom. 16:25-27).

---

[1] *συνέχει*

Paul has a passionate love for his own people.[1] In writing for the Gentiles Paul had not come to hate the Jews. They misunderstood him and persecuted him as a turncoat and a renegade as a perverter of the customs of the Jewish fathers. Paul knew the price that he would have to pay for his zeal for Christ and for the Gentiles. They tried to kill him in Damascus when he proved that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah (Acts 9:23). Christians and Jews alike in Jerusalem held aloof from Paul at first after his conversion (Acts 9:26-30; 22:17-21). The Jews dogged his steps in Paphos (Acts 13:6), in Antioch in Pisidia (13:45), in Iconium (14.5), in Lystra (14-19), in Thessalonica (17:5), in Corinth (18:6, 12), in Jerusalem (21:20, 27, etc.). They tried to kill Paul time after time, but he loved them as his very life and was willing, if it were proper, to be anathema from Christ for the sake of his Jewish people (Rom. 9:1-5). The rejection of Christ by the Jews broke Paul's heart, but not his love for them nor his faith in God's love for them nor his hope in good for them somehow in the end (Rom. 9:-11). And Paul claimed the Gentile converts as part of the spiritual Israel, the children of Abraham by faith (Rom. 9:6; Gal. 3:7). So Paul prayed for the Jews at the very time that they were turning away from Christ, their only hope (Rom. 10:1-4). The pathos of Paul's love for the Jews is shown in his warning of Gentile Christians by the parable of the wild olive branch stuck into the spiritual stock of true Israel contrary to nature (Rom. 11:11-

[1] See Chapter VII, *Paul and Patriotism.*

24). And yet Paul's love for the Jews did not shut his eyes to the stubborn fact of their refusal to follow Christ. But Paul made a plea for forbearance with the Jew and for not giving them up. It would have broken Paul's heart beyond measure if he could have known how the middle wall of hatred between Jew and Gentile that Christ had broken down by the blood of his Cross by making both Jew and Gentile love each other by loving God in Christ (Eph. 2) would rise again between Jew and Christian. The medieval misunderstanding in Europe between Christian and Jew lives on to-day in many parts of the world. Paul's passion for the Jews should reënforce the tears of Jesus over Jerusalem as a protest against present-day hatred between Christian and Jew.

Paul was not always understood by the Jewish Christians. Some of them, the Judaizers, charged that Paul was trying to make the Jews become Gentiles because he refused to make Gentiles become Jews. Against them Paul set himself with tremendous power and saved Christianity from becoming merely a form of Pharisaic Judaism instead of the true Judaism, that of the heart, the spiritual Israel. Paul was in the position of a missionary who is misunderstood by many of the people at home, who fail to sympathize with his mission abroad, who do not help his work, and who actually try to hinder his work (Gal. 1:6-10; 4:12-20; 5:7; 6:10; 2 Cor. 11:1-29). But he kept to his work. He always preached to the Jews in their synagogues as long as they would allow him to do so. These Jewish synagogues scattered over the world were nuclei for the spread of the gospel. There were numerous God-

fearers from among the Gentiles, like Cornelius in Cæsarea, who were predisposed to hear the gospel of grace. These Gentiles whom the Jews had already interested in the worship of God were a bridge by which Paul crossed over to the real heathen. One must bear in mind that the hard words of Jesus about proselytes and Pharisaism (Matt. 23:15) do not apply to all the converts to Judaism itself.

But Paul had a deep and commanding love for the whole race. Christ had broken down the middle wall of partition for him. He was debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish (Rom. 1:14). He recognized that the gospel came to the Jew first (Rom. 1:16; 2:10), but it did not stop with the Jew. The penalty came to the Jew first also (Rom. 2:9) as well as the privilege. That is always the peril of privilege. But the door of grace and of faith stood wide open to the Gentiles (Acts 14:27). That door has never been closed and it never will be. It is not easy for us to-day to understand the courage that Paul displayed, when in the midst of the Areopagus of Athens, Paul put Gentile and Jew on a par as alike the offspring of God (Acts 17:28). The prophets had included the Gentiles in the promises of God (Rom. 9:24-30). The Jews had overlooked Hosea and Isaiah, but it is all there. Race prejudice in Paul was slain by Christ: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female: for ye are all one *man* in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). That was the ideal of humanity in Christ as Paul saw it. It is still the goal of Christianity, but the battle with race prejudice, with class

prejudice, and with sex prejudice is not so nearly over as I thought in *The New Citizenship* (1918). But it will come. Paul fought for the freedom of the race in Christ (Gal. 5). "For freedom did Christ set us free." So Paul answered the Macedonian cry and the world cry. The nations had turned away from God and deserved the abandonment that had come to them (Rom. 1:2), the terrible tragedy of sin that meets one in China or Japan or India to-day. But these very nations are groping in the dark after God if haply they may feel after him and find him (Acts 17:27). And Paul went out to bear the torch to those that sit in darkness and that yearn for the dawn of the day that is so long in coming.

But with all of Paul's love for men he was not willing to compromise the gospel of grace to win easy converts.[1] It is easy to follow the currents of thought and of prejudice, to go with the tide. Paul found that the preaching of the Cross was a stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the Greeks (1 Cor. 1:17-31). The Jews had no room for the Cross in their system of rites and ceremonies. The Athenian philosophers had laughed Paul out of Athens (Acts 17). But all the same in Corinth he was going to stick to the Cross of Christ as the only hope of men (1 Cor. 2:1-5). The Corinthians would like a dash of philosophic new thought without the spiritual and ethical agony involved in the life of the Cross. Paul had not had an easy time. The Judaizers hounded his steps and beclouded his message and befogged his converts.

[1] See Chapter VI, *Paul's Ecclesiastical Independence*.

Paul had to fight off these enemies of the Cross among the preachers of so-called Christianity. Gnostics came to complicate matters still more by subtle philosophizing and the veneer of learning. These won many converts and did much to imperil the gospel of grace as is shown by Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles. But at the risk of schism Paul opposed both Judaizers and Gnostics as false brethren who were overturning the faith of their followers. With Paul loyalty to Christ was more important than outward union. Paul's attitude is in contrast to much sentimental talk to-day. Disunion is not an advantage *per se,* but organic union is a curse if it can only come at the cost of loyalty to the Cross of Christ. We should all search our hearts and be sure that we have the mind of Christ in what we teach. If we are sure of that, like Paul and like Luther, we can do no other. And we ought to do no other till we see differently, else we commit intellectual and moral *harikari.* There is an element of truth in the so-called indigenous Christianity, provided it is real Christianity. If one does not know what Christianity is, he is not fit to teach abroad or at home, certainly not as a missionary.

But Paul was in matters of detail the most yielding of men. "I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some" (1 Cor. 9:22). He was *suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.* Many a man has been *fortiter in modo* as well as *in re* and, as a result, he has lost *in re.* To be *suaviter in re* may mean, likewise, to lose *in re* by giving up the heart of the matter. Paul walked softly, as Roosevelt urged,

and carried a big stick in matters of principle. One has to know when to give in and when to stand firm. The same man who stood like a rock against the circumcism of Titus, a Greek, had Timothy, half Jew and half Greek, circumcized to allay Jewish prejudices and to open the door for his ministry. Paul fought the Judaizers to a finish for Gentile liberty and yet himself offered sacrifices in the temple in Jerusalem to allay Jewish distrust. He battled ever against the ceremonial and the moral law as a means of salvation and yet was perfectly willing for Jewish Christians to observe the Mosaic ritual if they wished to do so. He knew that the meat offered to idols was not actually contaminated thereby and yet he was willing to abstain from eating it if Jewish and Gentile brethren were made to stumble thereby (1 Cor. 8-10). He claimed the right to pay for his services as preacher, but refused to receive money from those who would misunderstand his doing so (1 Cor. 9 and 2 Cor. 11). He spoke in sympathy with Greek culture in the Areopagus (Acts 17), but did not scruple to claim his Pharisaic affiliations before the Sanhedrin (Acts 23). He would go as far to win Greeks, Romans, or Jews as he could without sacrifice of principle. Paul understood the standpoint of his hearers, but he was not afraid to make Felix tremble for his sins (Acts 24:25). One must know how to give and take if he is to get things done.

Paul planted the gospel in strategic centers in the Roman Empire, the great cities of the leading provinces. He tapped the great avenues of travel, the highways of civilization, the wonderful Roman roads

that ran east and west, north and south. These cities were linked together by the arteries along which commerce flowed. It is small wonder that Ramsay calls one of his books *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen.* He was a drummer for Christ who knew where to go and how to present his cause. He would begin where he could get a foothold, where there was a chance to put in an entering wedge as in Cyprus with the influence of Barnabas. He used the Jews whenever he could as a starting-point. He would win men and women of influence, if he could, as Sergius Paulus at Salamis in Cyprus and "the chief women" in Thessalonica. But he had most success with the common people in Corinth (1 Cor. 1:26-31) as elsewhere. Paul was not ashamed to win slaves to Christ and to call himself a slave of Jesus Christ. In his letters he addressed special paragraphs to the Christian slaves who found in Christianity the one ray of hope in a darkened world.

Paul would push on to harder fields, but he held what he had won. He was thoroughly evangelistic, but he sought to establish firmly the work before he left it. He was not afraid of Perga in Pamphylia with its pirates and mosquitoes nor of Pisidia with its perils of rivers and of robbers. Paul knew when to leave a field and when to make a stand. Sometimes he left under compulsion as from Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Philippi, Thessalonica. Sometimes he left under the impulse of a call elsewhere as from Troas to Macedonia. But Paul always had the whole field on his heart, the anxiety for all the churches (2 Cor. 11:28), wherever he was. So he had native pastors

appointed to carry on the work when he was gone. He sent messengers with letters of instruction and encouragement. He tried to build up the character of those already saved as he pushed the work on to harder and wider fields. Timothy and Titus are but two of many who helped Paul lengthen the cords and strengthen the stakes for Christ all over the Roman Empire. When he was in prison, he was still the leader of the hosts of God. His energy was unceasing.

Paul met persecution with wisdom and with courage. He did not court opposition. He was not seeking the martyr's crown. He left Antioch in Pisidia before attack was made, but in Lystra he waited for the actual onset. But Paul pushed his propaganda for Christ with the vision of victory. He would lose a battle and win a campaign. He had no thought of surrender or of ceasing his work. He was helped by some, hindered by others, left alone by still more. It mattered not. The Lord Jesus always stood by his side. He was always sure of that. Sometimes at critical moments he had a vision of the Lord who cheered him on to fidelity. At the very end the Lord Jesus stood by Paul and strengthened him (2 Tim. 4:17) so that he despised Nero and his lions. Undismayed, he looked on suffering for Christ as a gift of grace and a mark of glory. Death to him was but the ushering in of Christ with whom he would forever more be at home. That is the spirit of Jesus that mastered Paul and that will conquer the world if missionaries at home and abroad carry on as Paul did, Paul the Master Missionary Statesman of the Ages.

CHAPTER IX

PAUL'S INTEREST IN YOUNG MINISTERS

Paul was converted when a young rabbi, a graduate of the school of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, and he knew by bitter experience what it was to be a young minister in a hostile environment. The call to preach and to work among the Gentiles came at the time of his conversion or at least was made plain to Paul a few days afterwards in Damascus. We do not know the age of Paul at this time, but it was not long after the death of Stephen when he was called "a young man named Saul" (Acts 7:58). He was almost certainly not over thirty-five, probably several years younger. He was a man of parts and of the schools and already the leader of current Judaism when he suddenly enlisted under the banner of Jesus Christ whose cause he had sought to destroy. On Paul's return from Arabia and Damascus to Jerusalem, he was the object of suspicion and distrust by the disciples there till Barnabas stood sponsor for the sincerity of the new convert, the *quondam* wolf that now appeared as a sheep in the fold (Acts 9:26-28). It is clear that Paul never forgot this generous act on the part of Barnabas and it made him only too glad to join hands with him at a later time in the work in Antioch

(Acts 11:25) that led to the great campaign among the Gentiles (13:1-3). It is undoubtedly true that Paul's keen interest in younger preachers had this touch of personal experience. Barnabas had befriended Paul. In his turn Paul gave the helping hand to other younger servants of Christ. To be sure, when he was Paul the aged, he saw in the younger ministry the hope of the future. His plans and his purposes centered largely in their training as is plain in the Pastoral Epistles. Looked at from this standpoint much of the criticism of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles is beside the point.

But Paul's interest is at first personal, not ecclesiastical and doctrinal. He soon began a search for young men who showed signs of usefulness in the work for Christ. There is no phase of the minister's work that offers a richer reward than the discovery of young men whom the Lord can use in the Kingdom. Many of them are diamonds in the rough, but they will take polish and gain lustre and retain hardness if the real diamond. One must be on his guard not to do the calling himself instead of God. It requires wisdom and insight to be able to see the marks of the Spirit of God in the raw and callous young man who is struggling with his destiny. Paul had the gift in marvellous fashion. He was not equally fortunate in all his "finds," for men differ and always will. But it is a rich vein to work in Paul's career to search for his points of contact with the multitude of fellow-workers who co-operated with him. The evidence is very slight in many cases, but in some we can trace Paul's steps a good deal of the way. It will pay us

to see Paul at work with the young ministers whom he gathered round him from time to time.

In the case of John Mark it seems clear that he was a protégé of Barnabas, his cousin, who persuaded Paul to let him go along in the first tour "as their attendant" (Acts 13:5), whatever that may mean (see my *"Making Good in the Ministry: A Sketch of John Mark"*). Paul figures in the life of this young preacher as the candid critic who will not condone his grievous blunder at Perga when he refused to go on with the mission and went back to Jerusalem (Acts 13:13). Paul utterly refused to have Mark go again with them in the second tour even though the refusal led to a break with Barnabas (Acts 15:36-41). At first Paul seems to appear in an unfavorable light in this stern refusal to give Mark a second chance. But the time came when Paul saw that Mark had made good. Then Paul rejoiced in his success and in the end found Mark useful to him for ministering (2 Tim. 4:11), possibly while a prisoner in Rome for the first time (Col. 4:10) when he may even have read Mark's Gospel. At any rate Paul wished Timothy to bring Mark with him to be with Paul in the last days of his life on earth. Some young ministers cannot stand criticism, however just it may be and however needful. Time vindicated the wisdom of Paul's stand about Mark. It brought Mark face to face with his crisis and he responded to the wise guidance of Barnabas and came to be Peter's interpreter. His Gospel reveals the marks of his life with Peter (see my *Studies in Mark's Gospel*) and shows that Mark had in him the making of a man that was worth while. It is not

saying too much to add that Paul did Mark a good turn when he was unwilling to gloss over his conduct at Perga. Mark learned the lesson of Perga as many a minister who has made a mistake and has come back. Peter could cheer Mark by his own experience. Certainly Mark's final success gladdened Paul's heart. Nothing brightens a teacher's heart more than to see a young man learn from his mistakes to correct them and to make them stepping stones to service and to greatness of character.

Titus was Paul's own discovery and one of the jewels found in the first campaign, if not in Antioch before. He was a pure Greek, but we do not know the place of his abode. There is some likelihood that he was a brother of Luke (2 Cor. 8:16; 12:18) and for this reason he is not mentioned by name in the Acts as Luke himself is not. Paul apparently had him with him before the Jerusalem Conference, for he took him along and his presence gave great offence to the Judaizers there. Paul refused to allow Titus to be circumcised at the demand of the Judaizers for the sake of harmony (Gal. 2:3). If Paul surrendered about Titus, it was useless to pass resolutions of freedom for the other Gentiles. Titus summed up the whole issue. Titus himself proved to be a man of great ability, resourcefulness and courage and fully justified the fight for his spiritual freedom made by Paul. At the height of the troubles in Corinth Paul sent Titus who brought the majority of the church to Paul's view of things. As a result Paul called Titus "my partner and my fellow-worker" (2 Cor. 8:23). Titus "comforted" Paul greatly about Corinth (2 Cor.

7:6) and Paul sent him back to finish the collection and the work of readjustment. Titus was a strong staff of support for Paul in his old age. Paul left him in Crete "to set in order the things that were wanting" there (Titus 1:5) and then wrote him a brief Epistle that is full of nuggets of wisdom for the preacher. The advice given to Titus applies to the problems of the preacher to-day. The only solvent for social ills is the gospel of Christ and the preacher plays a great part in all social reconstruction. Paul was proud of "Titus, my true child after a common faith" (Tit. 1:4). The minister who has spiritual "sons in the gospel" is rich beyond measure. Titus was with Paul near the end, but was sent to Dalmatia (2 Tim. 4:10). Paul found delight in the prowess of this gifted young preacher.

Timothy was apparently one of Paul's converts on the first tour and was already at work in Lystra when Paul came back on the second tour. He had a good reputation among the brethren in Lystra and Iconium. Paul had lost Mark. Silas took the place of Barnabas. So Paul picked out Timothy to go forth with him (Acts 16:1-3). He caught Paul's eye and won his heart. Unfortunately he was half Greek and half Jew and would be continually provoking controversy as to whether he was Jew or Greek. So as a matter of prudence Paul had him circumcised. Timothy was with Paul during this second tour and shared Paul's travels and difficulties with courage and loyalty. He was ready to fit into Paul's plans in whatever way Paul desired. He was left behind with Luke in Philippi and then reappeared in Berœa (Acts 17:14) and prob-

ably in Thessalonica (Phil. 4:15-16). He went to Athens to see Paul and was sent back to Thessalonica (Acts 17:15; 1 Thess. 3:1-2). He later came with Silas to Corinth with news and gifts from Thessalonica and Philippi (Acts 18:5; 2 Cor. 11:9). He was with Paul in Ephesus in the third tour and was sent by him to Corinth to settle the trouble there, but the Judaziers seem to have overawed him (1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10-11). So Timothy returned to Ephesus and was sent on to Macedonia (Acts 19:22) while Titus went to Corinth to grapple with the Judaizers. Timothy was with Paul later in Macedonia (2 Cor. 1:1) and in Corinth and on the journey to Asia (Acts 20:4). He was Paul's chief reliance during the first Roman imprisonment, second only to Luke, and apparently present more constantly than Luke (Phil. 2:19-23). Timothy stood the test of time and nothing seemed ever to mar Paul's love for him. He was not always in vigorous health (1 Tim. 5:23). Paul gave him particular advice about exercise and health and diet. "Let no man despise thy youth" (1 Tim. 4:12). The two Epistles that Paul wrote to Timothy while he was in charge of the work in Ephesus cover almost every aspect of the young minister's life and work. Paul touches on Timothy's pious ancestry and prophecies made concerning his future usefulness. He must not disappoint these hopes. He must pay attention to reading and the scholarly side of his work. He must exercise leadership in the church work. He must train teachers who will carry on the work with success and power. He must preserve the pure gospel at a time when men had itching ears for heresy. He

must be faithful to all classes and not fear to speak plainly to the rich. He must be careful for his own spiritual growth and not fall into any of the many snares that the devil had set for young preachers (money, conceit, flattery, women, idleness). Paul called Timothy "true child in the faith" (Tim. 1:2) and he wanted him by his side when the end came (2 Tim. 4:11, 21). He apparently came and got arrested for doing so, for he was afterwards released (Heb. 13:23). Timothy loved Paul and proved worthy of his trust. "O Timothy, guard the deposit" (1 Tim. 6:20) which God had put into his care and keeping. In the Epistles to Timothy and Titus Paul proves himself to be the greatest teacher of preachers of all time, after Christ himself. The fiery ardor of 2 Corinthians and Galatians has burned lower as is natural with age, but the Pauline wisdom is here. The style is more discursive and circumstantial details concern the great master of principles, but they do not conceal the great heart of Paul the aged preacher in his deep concern for the progress of his younger brethren, that this progress may be manifest to all (1 Tim. 4:15). What a joy it was to Paul to see the prowess of Timothy under the tutelage of the Spirit of God.

Apollos cannot be called one of Paul's sons in the gospel, but he touched Paul's life and work in important ways and he drew forth Paul's sincere admiration and love at a time when some expected him to show jealousy and resentment. Apollos was a brilliant specimen of Alexandrian training in philosophy and general Greek culture who at first knew Jesus only as the Baptist did, but he was a powerful preacher

even with this serious handicap (Acts 18:24-28). He responded quickly to the tutelage of Priscilla and Aquila and went with letters of commendation to Corinth where Paul had labored for two years. The contrast between Apollos and Paul was quite marked and soon each had his partisans, though neither desired such a situation. Finally partisanship went to such a pitch that Apollos left and would not return (1 Cor. 16:12). Paul discusses the whole unfortunate situation in a masterly passage that is a model for ministers over whom a church has become divided (1 Cor. 1-4). Paul exonerates Apollos from any blame and glories in the great gifts of this brilliant young minister and shows how each has his gifts from God to whom all the glory belongs. Paul is sensitive lest the Corinthians may think that he is courting their favor and makes it plain that the minister is the steward of the mysteries of God who alone can give the praise that really matters (1 Cor. 4:1-5). So Paul uses Apollos and himself as a foil to reveal the narrow partisanship of the Corinthians and to shame them out of it all (1 Cor. 4:6-13). No man ever rejoiced more in the great gifts of other preachers than did Paul. Certain it is that Apollos learned much from Paul, especially if he is the author of the wonderful Epistle to the Hebrews which contains so much that is Pauline in conception, although almost certainly not from the pen of Paul himself. Paul later alludes to Apollos in a way that shows the utmost cordiality, if not the fact that Apollos was one of Paul's messengers to Titus in Crete (Tit. 3:13).

Silas was Paul's chosen companion for the second

tour after the break with Barnabas (Acts 15:40). He was a prophet (15:32) and one of the bearers of the Jerusalem Epistle to Ephesus to the Gentile Christians concerning their freedom from Jewish ceremonialism (15:27). He was loyal to Paul through this tour, shared Paul's imprisonment in Philippi and was in Thessalonica and Berœa with him and came with Timothy to Paul in Corinth. And then he drops out from Paul's company so far as we know. The reason is all conjecture. Silas was probably older than Timothy and Titus and nearer Paul's own age. It is probable that he reappears with Peter as the amanuensis of Peter in writing the First Epistle (1 Pet. 5:12). If so, he is in company with Peter and Mark. It may be suggested that Paul and Silas had a difference as was true of Barnabas and Paul. That, of course, is possible, but hardly likely. It is more probable that Paul in the third tour simply preferred younger men who more readily did the subordinate work and did not really need Silas who had other work of his own to do.

We may group together a bunch of Paul's helpers and co-workers of whom we catch only glimpses as they pass, snapshots taken in action. One of these is Trophimus of Asia (Acts 20:4), one of the messengers sent along with Paul to Jerusalem to bear the collection for the poor saints there. He was the innocent occasion of bringing great misfortune on Paul. Like Titus, he was a Greek. Some of the Jews of Asia saw Paul walking with Trophimus in Jerusalem (Acts 21:29) and "supposed" that he had also taken Trophimus with him into the temple beyond the court

of the Gentiles, for they saw Paul there. They raised a hue and cry and accused Paul of all sorts of crimes that kept him a prisoner in Cæsarea and Rome for five years before freedom came. Hate and a heated imagination do not require facts, but only an occasion. But Trophimus was in no way responsible for it all. Much later Paul left him at Miletus sick (2 Tim. 4:20) and Paul was concerned about him at the end.

Tychicus was another messenger from Asia with Trophimus (Acts 21:4), but it is not certain that he went on to Jerusalem. However, he was in Rome and was one of the bearers of the Epistle to the Colossians (4:7) and that to the Ephesians (6:21). He was with Paul again in the second Roman imprisonment and was sent by Paul to Ephesus on some errand of importance (2 Tim. 4:12).

Aristarchus had been seized along with Gaius by the mob in Ephesus as a companion of Paul (Acts 19:29). He was one of the Thessalonian messengers with Paul to Jerusalem (Acts 20:4). Later he was Paul's companion with Luke on the voyage to Rome (Acts 27:2), possibly, as Ramsay suggests, enrolling as Paul's slave so as to get on the ship. He was with Paul in Rome when he wrote to Philemon (23) and Paul calls him his "fellow-prisoner" (Col. 4:10).

There are others, like Erastus (Acts 19:22; 2 Tim. 4:20) who are more like silhouettes on the horizon. We cannot say that these counted for little or for nothing in Paul's life because of the bare mention of their names in the long and honorable list in Romans 16. And even in that list there are many whose

names are not given. They figure only as "the brethren." History is whimsical in its preservation of names and even of facts. It is certainly likely that Paul had many fellow workers who wrought as nobly as some of those whose names and deeds are preserved to us. They won Paul's love and that of Paul's Lord and they have received their due reward. But it is hard to think of one who ever gathered round him a nobler group of fellow-workers, both men and women, like Priscilla and Aquila with whom Paul dwelt in Corinth (Acts 18:2) and who risked their very lives for Paul (Rom. 16:4) as did Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:30). Paul had the keenest interest in people and had no lack of friends who were ready to share with him suffering and even death like Onesiphorus (2 Tim. 1:16-18).

But there were false friends who left Paul in a pinch like Demas who "loved this present world" (2 Tim. 4:10) and Alexander the coppersmith who did him much evil (4:14). And there were some like Phygelus and Hermogenes who turned away from Paul now a prisoner in Rome (2 Tim. 1:15). Paul knew the bitterness of "false brethren" (2 Cor. 11:26) as well as the joy of devotion to the death.

CHAPTER X

PAUL'S PREACHING IN THESSALONICA

It is not always proper for a preacher to speak frankly about his own preaching. He is almost certain to be accused of egotism. Even a teacher of young preachers has to be chary of personal allusions, rich as his experiences are and helpful to them. When a preacher is under fire he may sometimes explain his methods and motives to those who have been influenced by the attacks. But even then the minister feels a natural embarrassment and is open to counter-attack. As a rule, silence and right living is the best answer to traducers, "that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men" (1 Pet. 2:15).

Paul broke his silence under the attacks in Corinth in order to show that he and Apollos were both free from blame in the schism and strife that had come to that church (1 Cor. 1-4). In doing this needed service Paul takes occasion to set forth the character of his own preaching of Christ crucified. But Paul did hold the Judaizers responsible for the trouble in Corinth and they made serious and specific charges against Paul's ministerial integrity that he disproves in detail (2 Cor. 10-13). But in defending himself thus pointedly Paul felt like a fool and can only do it at all by a touch of irony to relieve the tension (2 Cor.

11:14-20). But one can almost thank the Judaizers for indirectly being responsible for Paul's wonderful panegyric on preaching in 2 Cor. 2:12-6:10 (expounded in my *"Glory of the Ministry"*).

Another bit of autobiography occurs in 1 Thess. 1 and 2 which can be compared with Acts 17:1-9. The account in Acts mentions only three Sabbath days on which Paul preached in Thessalonica, but it seems clear from 1 Thess. 1 and 2 and 2 Thess. 2 and Phil. 4:16 that Paul labored in Thessalonica some months, probably no longer in the synagogue (cf. Corinth). Luke probably did not mean to be exhaustive in his report. But it is extremely interesting to be able to compare the historical narrative in Acts 17 with Paul's discussion in 1 Thess. 1 and 2. We have a similar parallel in Luke's account of the work in Corinth (Acts 18) and Paul's own interpretation of his work there in 1 Cor. 1-4. In Thessalonica, as in Corinth, Paul was misunderstood by some. The misunderstanding related to Paul's remarks on the Second Coming of Christ. After Paul's departure the misunderstanding grew until Paul was quoted as saying that Jesus was going to come right away. This Paul specifically denies. Some one had even tried to palm off an "epistle" as from Paul supporting this view (2 Thess. 2:1-4). So he gives the token for a genuine Epistle of his (2 Thess. 3:17). There was really no excuse for misunderstanding Paul's preaching on this point. "Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" (2 Thess. 2:5). The struggle with the Man of Sin was first to come. And when Jesus does come, he will come as a thief in the

night as the Thessalonians knew perfectly well (1 Thess. 5:2), for he had told them so. Some had become so excited that they had quit work and were mere busy bodies. Here again they were without excuse, for, when Paul was with them, he had commanded them: "If any will not work, neither let him eat" (2 Thess. 3:10). It is a poor preacher who is never misunderstood. Jesus and Paul used plain and vigorous language, but they were often misunderstood. People hear only fragments of what we say to them and that is understood in the light of scraps of other ideas floating in their heads. So Paul writes two Epistles to the Thessalonians to make plainer what he had taught while with them. Thus we get his biographical remarks on his own preaching in Thessalonica that are so rich in suggestion for us to-day. Paul was the greatest of all preachers[1] and we could wish that we had more specimens of his preaching like those fragments preserved in Acts 13, 14, 17, 20, 28, and the apologies in 22 and 26. But he was able also to give the elements of great preaching in an incidental way as we find in 1 Thess. 1 and 2.

Luke tells that Paul's preaching was grounded on Scripture. In the synagogue "for three Sabbaths" Paul "reasoned with them from the Scriptures" (Acts 17:2). This was his custom, Luke adds, and he "opened" the Scriptures as a skilled interpreter "alleging" three affirmations in regular homiletical style: (1) "That it behooved the Christ (the Messiah) to suffer." This Jesus himself had taught (Luke

[1] Cf. Rosser, *Paul the Preacher.*

24:26, 46). (2) That it behooved the Christ "to rise again from the dead." This great fact Paul knew by personal experience. He had seen the Risen Jesus. (3) "And that this Jesus, whom I proclaim unto you, is the Christ" (the Messiah). This was Paul's fundamental thesis in his preaching from his conversion. In Damascus "straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God" (Acts 9:20). After his return from Arabia (Gal. 1:17) he "confounded the Jews that dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is the Christ" (Acts 9:22). Luke preserves one of Paul's sermons, that at Antioch in Pisidia, in which we see the line of argument and the skilful use of Scripture made by Paul (Acts 13:16-41). It was so convincing that the multitudes asked that it be repeated the next Sabbath, when the whole city came out. Paul was entirely too popular for the envious rabbis who interrupted the service (Acts 13:44-46). Paul's training as a student under Gamaliel stood him in good stead in his use of Scripture and in meeting rabbinical refinements. The points given by Luke for the discourses at Thessalonica are logical and were certainly effective, for some of the Jews were won to Christ and a great multitude of the devout Greeks (the God-fearers who attended the synagogue) and of the chief women not a few (Acts 17:4). The result was inevitable. The rabbis were moved with jealousy and sought a league with the rabble to put a stop to Paul's power by raising a riot and getting a political charge against Paul for preaching Jesus as a rival king against Cæsar (Acts 17:5-9), a curious parallel to the final charge against Jesus before Pilate. Paul probably

did preach Jesus as King and Lord of all and the rabbis were quick to distort his language. So in Thessalonica Paul came up sharply against the Man of Sin who set himself in the place of God (2 Thess. 2). The Roman Emperor was worshipped here as elsewhere and Paul proclaimed Jesus as Lord, not Cæsar (1 Cor. 12:1-3). There was this much of truth in the specious charge which the rabbis knew was not true. They themselves opposed Cæsar worship, but they did not say so. At any rate Paul had to leave Thessalonica and he already saw the coming conflict between Christ and Cæsar for the mastery of the world. Ramsay notes that Paul grew in grasp and prowess as a preacher as he faced at close quarters the imperial power of Rome.

The thing that Paul emphasizes chiefly about his preaching in Thessalonica is that he interpreted the will of God to them in all his messages. It is easy to make frequent use of the name of God and the will of God and for it to be mere cant. But that is not true of Paul. He knew what it is to be in touch with God. He is conscious that God has made known his Word to him. Here are some of his expressions about this matter. "We waxed bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God in much conflict" (1:2). "But even as we have been approved of God to be intrusted with the gospel, so we speak" (1:4). "We preached unto you the gospel of God" (1:9). "But, as it is in truth, the word of God" (1:13). Paul had a high conception of his own message and offers an example for the preacher of to-day. He was miles away from being a mere entertainer or even just a social reformer. Every vestige of pretense is gone.

There is no dress parade about Paul and no pious affectation. He stands forth as the prophet of God with a burning message from God that he must deliver. He will be heard whatever the result. If it be replied that the modern preacher can lay no claim to direct revelation from God, one must remember that Paul searched the Scriptures as we can do. We have the New Testament, Paul's own writings included, in addition to the Scriptures that Paul had. We have, besides, the long course of human history under the influence of the Christianity proclaimed by Paul. We have also the promises of the Holy Spirit who helped Paul. We need not claim new revelation as Paul had, but we have new light from conscience, scholarly research, history and science. Certainly no preacher need be in the dark concerning the will of God concerning the redemption of man. If the Gospel of God was plain to Paul, it ought to be plainer to us. The preacher to-day should have a clear message from God and he should speak it with a prophetic courage.

Paul makes it plain, as Luke does in Acts, that Christ is the central theme in "the gospel of God." "For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep we should live together with him" (1 Thess. 5:9-10). "We believe that Jesus died and rose again" (4:14). The Thessalonians were "to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, *even* Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come" (1:10). This from Paul we take as a matter of course. He was, as we know, a Christ-intoxicated man. He cared

not whether people thought him beside himself for Christ or not (2 Cor. 5:13). There is no "gospel" for Paul apart from Christ. There were those who preached other doctrines, but Paul refused to call their messages a real gospel of grace (Gal. 1:6-7; 2 Cor. 11:4). And the world will never get away from its need of Christ. There was never such a heart hunger for Christ as there is to-day all over the world.

Paul claimed that his preaching was with the power of the Holy Spirit. "Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance" (1 Thess. 1:5). The Thessalonians "received the word in much affliction, with the joy of the Holy Spirit" (1:6). Paul expected the Holy Spirit to bless his message, because it was about Christ and because it was the gospel of God. Had not God promised the power of the Holy Spirit to accompany preaching like that? It is at least worth while for every preacher to-day to search his own heart and see if he has really preached the full gospel of God and with "assurance" of God's blessing. He has said that his word will not return unto him void. It will be like bread cast upon the waters. It will come back after many days. Paul was not equally successful everywhere and not wholly so in Thessalonica. But the preacher can at least have a clear conscience if he preaches God's word and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Paul's purpose was to please God and not men. Every preacher likes to please men. Praise is sweet to any preacher, too sweet sometimes. But the preacher is a man under orders. His real praise must come from

God. He must tell the truth as God gives it to him to see it. "For our exhortation is not of error, nor of uncleanness nor in guile" (2:3). He must not tone down the message to suit the audience, "not as pleasing men, but God who proveth our hearts" (2:4). "For neither at any time were we found using words of flattery, as ye know" (2:5), "nor seeking glory of men, neither from you nor from others" (2:6). It is plain from these vigorous denials that Paul had been accused by some of this very thing, of being a timeserver who truckled to the foibles and fancies of the crowd.

Once more Paul scouts the charge of preaching for money, "nor a cloak of covetousness, God is witness" (2:5). "For ye remember, brethren, our labor and travail: working night and day, that we might not burden any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God" (2:9). If ever there was a manly preacher Paul was that man. To-day we do not let preachers work at a trade nor do we pay them enough to live on.

But Paul loved the people and dealt gently with them with all his fidelity to truth. He had the shepherd heart, the father heart, the mother heart. "But we were gentle in the midst of you, as when a nurse cherisheth her own children: even so, being affectionately desirous of you, we were well pleased to impart unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were become very dear to us" (2:8). Could a pastor speak more tenderly of the flock? "As ye know how we *dealt with* each one of you, as a father with his own children, exhorting you, and encouraging *you,* and testifying, to the end that ye

should walk worthily of God" (2:11). "Ye are our glory and our joy" (2:20). Paul "endeavored the more exceedingly to see your face with great desire" (2:17). There is no resisting a love like that. Paul literally loved people into loving Christ. He had the passion for souls in his preaching that yearned after them in Christ. He imparted "his own soul" when he preached and he won souls in giving his. There is no other way. Even Christ felt power go out of him. And Paul was willing to spend and be spent for their souls (2 Cor. 12:15).

These elements in Paul's preaching at Thessalonica may seem commonplace and even prosaic, but they are vital to all real preaching. One may read an essay without these elements of power, but no souls will be converted. He may preside over a pink tea with no passion for the lost. But the world waits to hear the prophet with a live coal from the altar of God on his lips. The tongue of flame will set other souls on fire. Beecher was right. Wake up the man in the pulpit if you want to wake up the man in the pew. The way to wake up the man in the pulpit is to put one there who is in touch with God. Then the Lord will make bare his arm in the day of his power. God had poured power into Paul and so he could do all things through Christ (Phil. 4:13).

CHAPTER XI

PAUL AS PASTOR IN EPHESUS

It is probable that Paul remained longer in Ephesus than in any of the cities where he founded churches. He was in Corinth about a year (Acts 18:11, 18), but three years in Ephesus (Acts 20:31). It so happens that Luke has preserved Paul's own epitome of his work in Ephesus in the address to the elders at Miletus (Acts 20:17-38). Luke heard this wonderful heart to heart talk to the ministers and he has preserved it with faithfulness. In this address Paul refers repeatedly to his conduct as pastor in Ephesus in a way that runs parallel to the historical narrative in Acts 19:1-20:1. By combining the two accounts we can form an intelligent conception of Paul's work in Ephesus in spite of the absence of any personal experience in the Epistle to the Ephesians. It is almost certain that this is a circular letter that went to Laodicea and Colossæ (Col. 4:16) as well as to Ephesus.

Paul is the foremost evangelist, preacher, theologian, and missionary statesman of Christian history. But he is great, also, as pastor. He had the shepherd heart. He loved the members of the flock and gave himself unreservedly to them. Probably these "elders" of the church at Ephesus (Acts 20:17) who came to Miletus to meet Paul on his way to Rome had

been picked out by Paul while in Ephesus and elected by the church as "bishops" (20:28). It is interesting to note the plurality of pastors in the new great church at Ephesus as in Philippi (Phil. 1:1). The same men are termed indifferently "elders" or "bishops" and they were "to shepherd the church of God which he purchased with his own blood." This verb to "shepherd" [1] is the same root as the substantive "shepherd" [2] like our "pastor." Here we have a threefold conception of the ministry for the same men. They were "elders" like the synagogue officers or the village rulers in the papyri of Egypt (our "aldermen") and the Japanese "Elder Statesmen," men of experience. They were "bishops" or "overseers" who watched over the welfare of all under their care. And they were also "shepherds" whose duty it was to feed the flock and to keep a sharp eye for the weak and the sick. "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops." Paul believed that each of these men had been set apart to this task by the Holy Spirit. They had been called of God as Paul was called of God. And yet Paul took the liveliest interest in hunting for ministers of the gospel. Dr. W. E. Hatcher, of Richmond, Virginia, had an interesting address on "the Human Element in the Call to the Ministry." Paul is here speaking face to face with the men whom he left in charge of the great work in Ephesus when he departed hurriedly after the uproar created by

---

[1] ποιμαίνειν

[2] ποιμήν

Demetrius (Acts 20:1). It is a great privilege for a minister of experience and power to speak frankly to a body of fellow ministers. Paul does it with consummate skill. The whole address is designed to equip them for better service in Ephesus. For that purpose he draws freely upon his own work there with these very men.

His life among them was an open book. "Ye yourselves know, from the first day that I set foot in Asia, after what manner I was with you all the time (Acts 20:18). This is only what every pastor should be able to say. The preacher who leads a double life is shorn of power on exposure and that is sure to come sooner or later. He had served "the Lord with all lowliness of mind" (20:19). The minister's message is measured by his life and by his spirit. This Paul fully recognized and frankly faced. Indeed, the preacher cannot escape it. The sermon that counts in the end is the life that either confirms or contradicts the eloquent words on Sunday. I sincerely believe that ministers on the whole are the noblest men in all the world. There are exceptions, beyond a doubt, and the downfall of a preacher gives every preacher a pang in his heart. The only way for the pastor to make his life preach is the path of sheer straightforwardness and open honesty.

The question of salary confronted Paul in Ephesus as in Corinth (1 Cor. 9; 2 Cor. 11). Ephesus was a mission field where many sophists and other peripatetic teachers taught wisdom for pay. There was no mission board to take care of Paul till the church could support him and understand that he was not a

financial adventurer. There is no evidence that Philippi and Thessalonica helped Paul in Ephesus as they did while he was in Corinth (2 Cor. 11:8-9; Phil. 4:15-16). What did Paul do? He was independent as he was in Thessalonica (2 Thess. 3:8) and in Corinth (2 Cor. 11:9). "I coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel" (Acts 20:33). The pastor ought to be paid a decent salary or be allowed to make his own living as Paul did. Paul had no need for ministerial discounts. He made his own living by his trade. "Ye yourselves know that these hands ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me" (20:34). He was not ashamed to show his rough, horny hands, used to manual toil. He labored for himself and for Priscilla and Aquila, apparently, as in Corinth (Acts 18:1-3). "In all things I gave you an example, that so laboring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, that he himself said, it is more blessed to give than to receive" (20:35). Paul offered himself as an example to these ministers from Ephesus in the matter of independence and simple duty to those dependent on one. The modern preacher is not allowed by public opinion to engage in secular pursuits as Paul did and yet he is paid, as a rule, too little to support his family in the decent comforts of life. Money is a peril to the preacher and Paul warned Timothy repeatedly against this snare (1 Tim. 6:3-10). But a man who will not provide for his own household is worse than an unbeliever (1 Tim. 5:8). To enforce this lesson of simple manliness Paul appeals to an otherwise unknown saying of Jesus that makes us hunger for all

those that have perished and to prize more highly those in the Gospels. The followers of Pythagoras referred to their master as "he himself" [1] as Paul does here.

Paul was a man of great tenderness. He speaks of his "tears" twice in this address (20:19, 31). He had written unto the Corinthians an epistle with anguish of heart and "with many tears" (2 Cor. 2:4). He remembered Timothy's tears (2 Tim. 1:4). Adolphe Monod has a sermon on the Tears of Paul (Tears of Sorrow, Charity, Tenderness) in his "Five Discourses of Paul." The emotional side of a preacher's life is a point of contact with the hearts of his hearers. Certainly Paul was intellectual and practical if ever a preacher was. He was not merely emotional without conviction and vigor. But it may be questioned if modern ministers have not gone too far in restraining natural emotion. It is so easy to be purely professional. Tears then are unnatural if not like the crocodile's tears. Sympathy must be genuine and sincere, else the profession of it is offensive. Jesus wept with Mary and Martha before he raised Lazarus from the grave. Jesus wept over Jerusalem before he pronounced woes upon it. The preacher whose heart is deeply stirred even to tears, is the man whose message will grip the *hearts* of others. Paul's tears were not simply tears while preaching. They were in secret often as he served the Lord with tears (Acts 20:19). They were in the admonishing that Paul gave the Ephesians in private

[1] *αὐτός*

as in public, "night and day with tears" (20:31). There is no resisting a pastor like that whose passionate sympathy touches every life.

Paul was far more than a pulpiteer, though he was the greatest of preachers. He had the note of reality in all his work and so he taught "from house to house" as well as "publicly" (20:20). This private ministry is where many ministers fail. One is reminded of the woman who said that when her pastor was in the pulpit she wished he would never leave it and when he was out of it she wished he would never enter it. There are two extremes among preachers in their private conversations and visitations. One is that of lightness and levity with no interest in the spiritual life. The other is that of zeal without knowledge that does not know how to seize incidental things and to use them skilfully for winning the unsaved. In both cases the preacher repels either by carelessness or by awkwardness and more harm than good is done. The picture of Paul in the homes of Ephesus is presented by the house to house ministry. Pastoral visiting can be a bore or at best perfunctory. In these days the pastor has to learn how to go to the office and the store or the shop and to put in a wise word quickly and briefly so as to get a grip on the men. It is not enough to visit the women in the homes. The men must be reached as well as the children. Paul "went about preaching the kingdom" (Acts 20:25). That was his business. He knew how to be congenial and to make friends, but he never forgot the main thing, "testifying both to Jews and to Greeks repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ"

(20:21). He had the same message for all classes and at all times both in public and in private.

The pastor is constantly tempted to tone down the message because of peculiar conditions or to overemphasize one doctrine because of resentment at certain situations. It requires wisdom to keep the balance and to be faithful all round. Paul reminds the elders "how I shrank not from declaring unto you anything that was profitable" (20:20). Preaching to be effective must be pertinent and make a hit. It is so easy to grow eloquent in the denunciation of the sins of people elsewhere. Paul took his work seriously and felt his responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the church in Ephesus. As he looks back upon it all now he is able to say what every pastor wishes he can say: "Wherefore I testify unto you this day that I am pure from the blood of all men" (20:26). That is a great thing to be able to say. It can only be true when the pastor has done his full duty to all classes in public and in private. The reason that Paul feels constrained to say it is this: "For I shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God" (20:27). It is worth while to note his words, "the whole counsel of God." One may be loyal in all that he says and does and yet may omit something vital by his silence. It is a wise pastor who knows when to speak and when to be silent without disloyalty to the truth of God. But Paul keeps his eye on "the whole counsel of God," not on the fear of men.

Paul had his "trials which befell me by the plots of the Jews" (20:19). Some of these are narrated

by Luke in Acts 19. Paul, as was his custom, "entered into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, reasoning and persuading as to the things concerning the kingdom of God" (19:8). Soon he was compelled to leave the Jewish synagogue in Ephesus for the school of Tyrannus where he reasoned daily for the space of two years (19:9-10). It was a beautiful combination of church and school and such an intensive campaign over so long a period was bound to have results. All the province of Asia felt the force of Paul's work in Ephesus (19:10). The school of Tyrannus became the spiritual dynamo for all the province and it has left its mark upon the world.

Luke narrates three striking incidents connected with Paul's work in Ephesus. One is the unusual type of miracles that occurred. In some cases the handkerchiefs of Paul were carried away to the sick so that disease left them. One is reminded of the woman who touched the hem of Christ's garment. We may readily admit the superstition connected with this faith. But, after all, is there no superstition to-day in the faith of this or that belief? God honors not the superstition, but the faith. Many of us are blessed in spite of ignorance and narrowness of view. Certainly there was no magic in Paul's handkerchiefs. Some would say that Luke was merely recording legends connected with Paul's work.

The next incident concerns the seven sons of Sceva, a strolling Jewish exorcist who came to Ephesus. He had his incantations by which he claimed to cast out demons without doing it. He thought that he would

try the new "spell" that Paul employed. So he said to a demoniac: "I adjure thee by the Jesus whom Paul preaches" (19:13). It was like a boomerang. The demon retorted: "Jesus I know and Paul I know: but who are ye?" (19:15). The demon came out all right, but leaped on the seven sons of Sceva, probably all of them ("both" in the papyri occurs in this sense), and mastered them so that, naked and wounded, they fled out of the city. The outcome of this encounter stirred all Ephesus, which was the center of a vast literature concerning charms and incantations. Some of the magicians themselves brought their magical books and burned them in a big pile. If all the bad books and magazines of our cities could be burned, it would be a huge and a holy holocaust. And then if the vicious and vile vampire and bandit movie pictures could be burned, we should see a new and powerful peril removed from our public life. "So mightily grew the word of the Lord and prevailed" (19:20). Paul was a prophet in Ephesus in his denunciation of the perils of that city. He touched the life of Ephesus in its very center.

The other incident relates to the worship of Diana whose great temple was the pride of the city. The people boasted that their city was the temple-keeper of the great Diana (19:35). The temple was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. One of the enterprises of the city was the manufacture of little silver shrines of the goddess Diana which "brought no little business unto the craftsmen" (19:24). Demetrius was the head of one of these "god-factories" in Ephesus. It is not clear that Paul

ever attacked Demetrius or his business by name. But the success of Paul's work meant decrease in business for Demetrius, who was quick to see the peril to his own pocket. The saloon men saw what Christianity meant for their business and long ago began to fight the preachers who attacked their vested rights strongly entrenched in government and law. So the movies to-day are resisting real control by the public. Demetrius did a shrewd thing. He called together the fellow-craftsmen, the guild or union of shrine makers, and frankly appealed to their self-interest: "Sirs, ye know that by this business we have our wealth" (19:25). Then he recounted how "this Paul" preached that "they are no gods that are made with hands" (19:26), as if they did not make the best brand of gods in all Asia! So then there was "danger that this our trade come into disrepute" (19:27). This is the meat in the cocoanut and it is a tremendous tribute to the power of Paul's work in Ephesus. The preacher of righteousness cannot wink at business that is tainted with idolatry, licentiousness, graft, oppression of the poor, the ruin of girls. Now, as then, such business men will strike back under exposure. Let them do it. Public opinion will vindicate righteousness in the end even though the preacher fail at first. Demetrius mentions also that the worship of Diana was in peril, which was true. So he gives the crafty craftsmen a slogan which they shout on the streets of Ephesus: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians" (19:28), with never a word about their private pelf and selfish concern. Thus the mob is roused against Paul on patriotic grounds as a Jewish interloper who

threatened the glory of Ephesus, the temple of Diana. The mob got two of Paul's companions in travel, Gaius and Aristarchus of Macedonia (19:29). Paul was not a man to let others suffer for him and to hold off himself (19:30), but the Asiarchs, men of prominence in the city who liked Paul, simply would not let him go to be consumed by that mob of wild beasts (19:31). Paul says that he "fought with the wild beasts at Ephesus" (1 Cor. 15:32). Does he refer to the yells of these human wolves beneath his window? Or does he refer to another incident when he, as a prisoner in Ephesus, may have been thrown into the arena with actual wild animals and somehow escaped? Probably the first, though we do not know. It seems likely that Paul was very ill either at this very time or at another time, for he felt that he had the sentence (answer) of death at that time in Ephesus (2 Cor. 1:8-11), but God heard his cry and lifted him up. It is possible that Paul lay sick in his bed as he heard the mob in Ephesus howling for his blood, led on by Demetrius. At any rate we know that, after the town-clerk at Ephesus dismissed the riotous mob in the amphitheater, Paul left Ephesus sooner than he had planned to do (Acts 20:1-3). His work in Ephesus had been too successful in a way. He had certainly stirred the city, but it was not prudent to stay longer now. How many a pastor since Paul left Ephesus has had to follow in his wake? But the world is wide and the pastor whose courage has brought a crisis in one city can go on to another. Far better this than a sleepy quiescent pastorate of many years with no results.

Paul now has his face set to go to Jerusalem and is on his way. While in Ephesus Paul had his plans laid to go to Macedonia, Achaia, Jerusalem, and on to Rome (Acts 19:21-22). He said: "I must also see Rome." And now he has been to Macedonia and Achaia and is en route to Jerusalem with the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem from Asia, Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia. The messengers of the churches are with Paul on the trip (Acts 20:4). He had premonitions of trouble in Jerusalem on the occasion of this visit as far back as in Corinth when he wrote to Rome (Rom. 15:31). The Judaizers had given Paul trouble in Antioch and in Galatia and in Corinth and he fears their influence on the Jerusalem church. "And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Spirit testifieth unto me in every city, saying bonds and afflictions abide me" (Acts 20:22-23). For some men such warnings would have been enough to change their course, but not so for Paul. Duty was not to be set aside by danger. "But I hold not my life of any account as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (20:24). That is the spirit of the hero. It is not the language of a braggart and of a coward, but of the true soldier who sees the peril and faces it fearlessly. This is the man who left Ephesus, Philippi, Corinth and many another city when it was best for the cause of Christ for him to go. But now he walks calmly into supreme danger for the sake of that

same cause. He is "bound in the spirit" to go to try to prevent a schism in Jerusalem. This he did, though he ran into peril from the Jews in pacifying the Judaizers. He did stick to his course till he finished it (2 Tim. 4:7). After leaving Ephesus Paul was warned at Tyre (21:4) and even at Cæsarea in most dramatic fashion by Agabus against going on to Jerusalem (21:10-11). But Paul could only say: "What do ye, weeping and breaking my heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus" (20:13).

But Paul is concerned about the future of the flock in Ephesus. "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (20:29). There were probably already signs of the Gnostic movement that swept over the Asian churches (see Colossians, 1 Timothy, 1 and 2 Peter, the Epistles of John). Paul could not be content to see these slick-tongued deceivers undo the work of grace that he had wrought during the three years in Ephesus. That fear grips every true pastor's heart. He can leave the town with a glad heart if the work goes on and well. But if it is pulled down and the sheep are scattered by the wolves, he has a heavy heart. And even among the elders of Ephesus Paul sees signs of apostasy. "And from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them" (20:30). Jesus had his Judas and Paul at Ephesus had some whom he distrusted with reason. It is sometimes said that the Pastoral Epistles are not Pauline because they betray an un-Pauline concern

about the future of Christianity. But here in the speech to the elders of Ephesus at Miletus Paul sees the cloud arising in Asia where Timothy was to labor and to grapple with the wolves whom Paul saw in the distance.

Paul felt confident that this group of ministers would see his face no more (20:25). This foreboding added greatly to the sorrow of the parting as they knelt down and prayed and wept sore and fell on Paul's neck and kissed him (20:36-38). It was a tender time as the preachers from Ephesus stood on the shore and saw the ship put out to sea with their great master on board. His words about himself and about them had been solemn enough, but his own courage put strength into their hearts as they turned their way back to Ephesus to tell the church the great message that they had received from Paul. It seems probable that Paul on his return from the first Roman imprisonment did come to Ephesus again (1 Tim. 1:3). Certainly he was at Miletus when he left Trophimus sick (2 Tim. 4:20). Even so it is doubtful if all the elders were alive, though Paul only gave his own apprehension about not seeing them again. It was a great experience, those three years at Ephesus, and the story of them will richly repay the study of any modern preacher.

Paul's last words in his address may serve as Paul's benediction on all preachers: "And now I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build *you* up, and to give *you* the inheritance among all them which are sanctified" (20:32). Cer-

tainly preachers most of all should be built up by the word of God's grace which they proclaim. If it is food for the saints, it should first feed the shepherd of the flock.

CHAPTER XII

PAUL IN THE CENTER OF GREEK CULTURE

The presence of Paul in Athens was due to accident according to the narrative in Acts 17:15. The Jewish rabbis who ran Paul and Silas out of Thessalonica followed them to Berœa. This time they sent forth Paul as far as the sea while Silas and Timothy remained still in Berœa. Evidently Paul was the chief object of Jewish jealousy and hatred. But Paul's companions went with him as far as Athens and took back "a commandment unto Silas and Timothy that they should come to him with all speed" (Acts 17:15). It seems that Timothy did come to Paul in Athens from Berœa, but was almost immediately sent by Paul to Thessalonica because of distressing news of misapprehension there. "Wherefore when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left behind at Athens alone; and sent Timothy, our brother and God's minister in the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith" (1 Thess. 3:1-2). Luke does not narrate this brief visit of Timothy to Athens, but states that, after Paul has gone on to Corinth, Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia (Acts 18:5). Evidently Timothy played a very small part in the work in Athens. It would seem from Acts 18:16 that Timothy did not

come till after the first events at Athens, "while Paul waited for them at Athens." He may not have come till shortly before Paul left Athens (Acts 18:1), but the point is immaterial. To all intents and purposes Paul was alone in Athens and apparently was planning to go on elsewhere, but could not resist the appeal of this center of intellectual life for the message of the Cross of Christ.

Athens was still the intellectual capital of the world. There were universities at Pergamus, Tarsus, and Alexandria, but Athens had the prestige of age and the éclat of great names in philosophy and letters. The names of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Lysias, Demosthenes, to go no further, still shed a halo around the temples, groves, and walks of Athens. There are those who think that Paul was not responsive to the intellectual and artistic atmosphere of Athens, that he was wholly out of touch with the Greek love of beauty and art for art's sake, that Greek literature and philosophy, like Greek mythology, repelled Paul, that he was distinctly out of his element in Athens and did not know how to present the gospel of Christ to the intellectuals of Athens, that Paul was un-Hellenic and not a university man. Others affirm that Paul was a university man, a product of the University of Tarsus as well as of the rabbinical school of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, that he had a wide acquaintance with literature and philosophy as is shown by the fine literary finish of the Greek style in the address in Athens (allowing for Luke's influence in the report) and by the literary allusions in the

address to Aratus, Cleanthes, and Epimenides. They even affirm that Paul made something of a compromise of the Christian message in the scholastic environment of Athens and went as far as he could, possibly too far, to reach the philosophic minds in his audience, an effort that resulted in failure, and that Paul vowed never to repeat this experiment (1 Cor. 2:1-5). There is an element of truth in both of these extreme views as is shown in the narrative in Acts. Paul's "spirit was provoked within him as he saw the city full of idols" (Acts 17:16). This is the outstanding fact of Paul's reaction to the pagan splendor all around him. He was a man of genius and of intellectual training. He did have a point of contact with the cultural side of Athens. He knew some of the Greek poets whom he quotes in his address. He shows so much acquaintance with Stoicism in his Epistles that Lightfoot gravely discusses the question whether Paul knew the writings of Seneca. Sir W. M. Ramsay even calls Paul the greatest philosopher of the ages. He dares to present his philosophy of the universe in opposition to that of the Epicureans and of the Stoics in Athens. Clearly, then, Paul's conduct in Athens raises the whole question of Christianity and culture to-day. In a brilliant article on "Christianity and Learning" in the January, 1921, *Biblical Review* Dr. E. M. Poteat affirms that we have not yet brought learning in captivity to Christ, that a pagan atmosphere still rules in many of our schools of learning. In *The Methodist Review* (New York) for Jan.-Feb., 1921, Dr. H. P. Sloan seriously argues whether a "University Can Be Christian." Certainly some teachers in our

modern schools are frankly anti-Christian and laugh Christianity out of court as some of the Athenians laughed at Paul in Athens.

The result is a widening breach between learning and faith that is to be deplored. It is a sad thing to see young people, reared in homes of piety and faith, come back from college with intellectual pride and with scorn for the Bible and the Christ of the Bible. Part of this result is due to the sudden clash between the new and the old that is overcome in time. Part of it is due to what Chesterton calls "the ignorance of the educated," the one-sided knowledge of specialists who dogmatise in realms outside of their specialty. There is no intolerance greater than intellectual bigotry which assumes infallibility in all things because of special knowledge in one sphere of learning. Christians retort with indignation against the harm to their own boys and girls by sceptical, even infidel, professors. So the breach widens. But Christ is not hostile to learning. He calls himself "the truth." No real discovery in nature or in grace is really outside of the sphere of Christ's interest. Every lover of Jesus Christ should be a friend of all real progress in human knowledge. The Greek word for truth means to be unconcealed, to have the lid off. There is nothing in the works of God to make one fear for the Word of God.

It is extremely interesting to observe how Paul bore himself in the midst of beautiful, artistic, intellectual, idolatrous Athens. There is no cringing, no faltering, no flattery. He is not ashamed of the gospel of Christ in the University seat of the world. Unfortunately

the address was interrupted so that we can only infer what he meant to add, but what he did speak shows his purpose. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus outlined the relation of Christianity to Judaism. Here Paul presents the contrast between Christianity and Paganism. To be sure, in Athens he had found the Jews also and "the devout persons" from among the Gentiles who came to the synagogue. With them Paul "reasoned in the synagogue" (Acts 17:17) according to his custom in every city. And in the market-place (the agora) he spoke every day with the chance-comers (17:17), as was the custom in Athens. Paul was, in fact, a street preacher, but with this difference, that in the agora every one had open access to every one else. Hyde Park in London is a modern parallel on a small scale. Socrates had not been above talking in the agora with the sophists or with any who wished to discuss philosophy with him.

It is not strange, therefore, that in the agora Paul came in touch with exponents of Epicureanism and of Stoicism, the two leading philosophies of the day. They challenged Paul and compared notes[1] with him, much to the discredit of Paul. Philosophers are none too considerate of each other when they clash, though usually technical verbiage conceals some of their scorn. Undoubtedly Paul attacked some of the sophistries of both the Epicureans and the Stoics, for these rival schools joined in derision of Paul. He did not use the lingo of the initiated and so they sneered at him. "What would this babbler say?" (17:18.) The

[1] συνέβαλλον

word for "babbler" means literally a picker-up of seeds like the birds that hopped about in the agora. It was an expression of supreme contempt such as many another preacher of Christ has encountered in a scholastic center where religion has been held up to ridicule as a superstition of the ignorant that the university man has shaken off. There were others who in a more apologetic mind, but with equal intellectual superciliousness, interpreted Paul as "a setter forth (proclaimer) of strange deities (demons)" (17:18). The tone is unmistakable, but the charge that Paul is a preacher of polytheism reveals the dense ignorance of these learned wiseacres. They took the "resurrection" to be a deity on a par with Jesus. But it is at least clear that in his tilt with the philosophers in the agora Paul preached (as an evangel) both Jesus and the resurrection. Evidently the cross came in also for that is what gives meaning to the resurrection. So we see Paul as the evangelist to the philosophers and the university circle of Athens. He won a hearing for the moment if no more. One is reminded of D. L. Moody at Oxford University and of the profound impression made upon the student life of that generation in Britain. It is possible for the preacher of the gospel to get a grip on the intellectual life of the time. Henry Drummond did it, John A. Broadus did it, and Robert E. Speer has done it.

It is not clear what was the purpose of those who finally took hold of Paul and brought him before the Areopagus. It is not even certain whether by "the Areopagus" is meant the hill or the court of that name. It could be the council that met on the famous hill

near the Acropolis. In later times the council met on the hill for murder cases and other extreme criminal cases, but in the *stoa basileios* [1] for religious questions as in the case of Socrates who was arraigned for introducing strange divinities. On the whole the idea of the council rather than the place has the best of argument at the present. But the further question remains whether Paul was formally on trial before the court as a wrong-doer or was merely rushed by the philosophers before the council to see if he should be allowed to continue his popular harangue in the agora. Paul had no standing as a university lecturer, but it would be interesting to see what the council thought of his views. Their motive may have been hostile or merely friendly zeal to press him to go on as a form of popular entertainment. The language is polite and yet there is point enough to catch the attention of the council (17:19-20). In any case a crowd of hangers-on gathered round the council to hear the outcome concerning the new teacher who had aroused the interest of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. The flippant curiosity of the Athenians is attested by Demosthenes and Thucydides. They wanted, not merely the new thing (the news), but the "newer" than the "new," the very latest bit of gossip, the freshest tidbit of philosophic speculation, the very last "extra." So Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus with his chance to put the cause of Christ before the council, the philosophers, and the crowd, if they would listen to him. They would for a while at

[1] στοὰ βασίλειος

any rate. It was his great opportunity in Athens.

The introduction is conciliatory and winning. Paul must catch the ear of this critical audience. For this reason it seems impossible to think that Paul used the sense of "superstitious" rather than "religious." The word is employed in both senses by the Greeks, but Paul desires to win favor for his message, not to drive away the sympathy of his audience. His spirit had been provoked as he saw the many idols in the city and that the intellectual center of the world. Certainly they were more religious than usual and more superstitious also. It is even possible that the double sense of this adjective piqued the interest of the audience to see in which sense Paul used it. Josephus says that the Athenians were the most devout of all the Greeks. There were said to be thirty thousand statues in Athens to various divinities. Pausanias states that the Athenians were very pious.

Paul's theme is happily introduced. He cites an incident from his own observation in Athens. Instead of saying "idols" (cf. 17:14) he spoke of "the objects of your worship." He wishes to turn the instinct and habit of worship in the right direction. So eager were the Athenians to worship all the gods that they set up an altar "To an Unknown God" (17:23). This inscription shows that the Athenians recognized that there might be a god of whom they had not heard. Pausanias, Philostratus, and Diogenes Laertes speak of altars to unknown gods. So Paul took advantage of this opening to introduce his theme and to correct also the misapprehension that he was a polytheist. Besides, Paul avoided the charge of illegality in intro-

ducing "strange gods" by showing that he was really proclaiming the God whom they were trying to worship without understanding his real nature. He at once is more skilful than Socrates was. "What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this I set forth unto you" (17:23). He has called no name as yet, but his theme is "The Unknown God." It is striking and catches their attention and it opens the door wide for his message without any legal complications. He has increased the natural curiosity of the Athenians for discovery.

The argument of Paul is clear and logical and progressive. He at once proceeds to tell who this God is, "the God that made the world and all things therein," "Lord of heaven and earth" (17:24). He says nothing about other gods at this point, but he leaves no room for them. This picture of God as the Creator of all things would appeal to the imagination of the Athenians whether they accepted it or not. They had gods for almost every virtue and vice (alas), for every phase of life. They were used to the idea of a limited God and even Zeus was only *primus inter pares* and had decided limitations to his power on earth and on Mount Olympus.

But Paul's next point draws the line of cleavage sharply between this "Unknown God" and all other gods. "He dwells not in temples made with hands" (17:24). The Parthenon, the most beautiful temple in the world and even now in its ruins the wonder of our modern time, was probably in full sight as Paul spoke. It was believed to be the home of Athene (Minerva), the patron goddess of wisdom and the arts

and of Athens. There were other glorious temples in full view. Paul has now struck at one of the tap-roots of pagan mythology, its belief in local gods that had local habitations. Jesus had taught that God was a spirit and could be worshipped anywhere as well as in Jerusalem or on Mount Gerizim. Stephen was stoned by the Jews for saying and proving from the Old Testament (Isa. 66:1-2) that Jesus was right and can be worshipped by Gentile or Jew anywhere. It was not a national deity, Jewish or Greek or German, that Paul proclaimed, but the God of all men.

Paul next demolishes another pagan error that God "is served by men's hands, as though he needed anything" (17:25). In its crudest form the heathen held that the deity was to be fed by the food in the sacrifices. Others wished to appease the god from his wrath by votive offerings. The Old Testament had already refuted the fallacy of this notion (Isa. 66:1-2; Ps. 5:8-12). Paul shows the crudity of that idea since God "himself gives to all life, and breath, and all things" (Acts 17:25). This "Unknown God" is both Creator and Preserver of all things. He is himself the Life of the Universe. Probably only the more intelligent could follow Paul in the greatness of this thought, the true philosophy of the universe. The Epicureans were practical atheists while the Stoics were really pantheists. But Paul proclaims one personal God whose will dominates the universe. Socrates and Plato had glimmerings of such a view, but not consistently as they allowed other gods beside the one supreme God. Jesus had taught that, since God is spirit, he must be worshipped in spirit. So Stephen

taught when Paul consented to his death. But now Paul is the true successor of Stephen in the spiritual interpretation of worship.

Paul now proceeds to prove that Greeks as well as Jews should worship the "Unknown God" (17:26-28). He is the God of all men and not of any one race or nation. "He made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." It is worth noting that it is a Jew who is here proclaiming the unity of the race, a Jew who has seen the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile broken down on the Cross by the blood of Christ and the enmity slain thereby (Eph. 2). Whether or not evolution be the process by which God brought man's body to be ready for the spirit of man in the image of God, it remains true that we are God's offspring as Aratus and Cleanthes had said of Zeus. Paul boldly applies these words of the Greek poets to the "Unknown God" whom he now makes known to them. He quotes also a line from Epimenides, as Dr. J. Rendel Harris has shown, "for in him we live and move and have our being." The Greek poets thus had glimpses of the truth about our relation to the Father of all men. God is thus pictured by Paul as the Father of the whole race, not meaning at all that all men are saved, but that God as Creator is the Father of their bodies and spirits. The whole race is thus bound to God and to each other, sinful and erring and disobedient though they are. God's providential hand is seen in the history of nations whose "appointed seasons" are determined by him as well as "the bounds of their habitations." God is not an absentee God

with no interest in the race, but he is actively at work with his redemptive purpose (cf. John 3:16). Paul is not unmindful of the fearful plight of the heathen nations as described in Romans 1 and 2, but it is the will of God "that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him and find him," yes, and come back to him as Jesus made plain in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, come back with repentant hearts and find forgiveness and pardon if they come thus because of what Jesus has done to save them. Paul's language describes a man groping in the dark by feeling with his hands, like Helen Kellar, in order to reach out after God, like the tendrils of the plant turning toward the light. The heathen are "without excuse" (Rom. 1:20), but the yearning heart of God the Father has not been far from them all the time, "though he is not far from each one of us," if we only knew it and heard his voice of appeal to come back to him. It was a wonderful message of grace with the very heart of the gospel that Paul was giving to the Athenians. Surely some of them would hear and heed.

Paul is now ready to take up definite items that are involved in God's plan of redemption for all men. The first one that he mentions is refusal to worship idols. *Noblesse oblige.* The "offspring" of such a God as this one whom Paul proclaims should not degrade themselves or him by thinking "that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man" (17:29). We are not of wood or stone or silver or gold. Why should our Father be? How can he be? It is a powerful thrust at the heart of idolatry. Paul is not deterred by the beau-

tiful statues of gods and goddesses at every turn from declaring this fundamental truth. The intellectual leaders of men at that time lived in an atmosphere of idolatry that stultified the human reason. Man is above the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms. He reaches up toward God and in his spirit bears the stamp of God's own image, though now marred by sin.

Paul calls for action on the part of his hearers. "The times of ignorance God overlooked" (17:30), not with complacency, but with patient forbearance and longsuffering. The race was not destroyed, but allowed to live. "But now he commands men that they should all everywhere repent" (17:30), even the philosophers in Athens. Jesus has come and has brought life and immortality to light. The day has come after the long night. Paul uses the word "repent" before the Council of the Areopagus as John the Baptist did to the Pharisees and Sadducees, as Jesus did to all, as Peter did to the Sanhedrin. It is not just to Paul to say, in the light of all this, that he cringed before the Areopagus and the culture of Athens and failed to declare the real gospel of repentance for sin.

Besides, Paul warned the Council of the Areopagus and all the Athenians that God "has appointed a day in which he will judge the world of righteousness" (17:31). This of itself was a bold declaration, for Socrates had been condemned by the Court of Areopagus in unrighteousness. But Paul goes on to say that the whole world will be judged on that day "by the man whom he hath ordained" (17:31). It has

been observed by many that up to this point Paul has not mentioned Jesus. He has even been accused of going off into philosophy and avoiding mention of Jesus. But that is to misunderstand Paul utterly. He had preached Jesus and the resurrection boldly in the market-place (17:18) and had been misunderstood by the philosophers who asked for further light from Paul on the subject. Paul evidently felt that he must give the historical, philosophical, and theological background for the gospel of Jesus so that he could explain how and where the resurrection of Jesus came in. This he did in masterful fashion. He now shows the reason for the resurrection of Jesus which they had not understood: "whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he has raised him from the dead" (17:31). God has set his mark of approval on Jesus as the Judge of all by raising him from the dead. If Paul had been preaching to Jews, he would have said "Messiah" instead of "Judge." But the Athenians would not understand "Messiah." Paul has interpreted the Mission and Message of Jesus as Saviour and Judge in language that the Athenians can comprehend. He probably had much more to say, but one must note that Paul did not flinch at the mention of sin, repentance, judgment, resurrection. In the classic university atmosphere of Athens he was true to the heart of the gospel.

The reason that Paul did not say more is that his audience left him. "The resurrection of the dead" broke the spell of interest. Some openly mocked him aloud and left in disgust. Others who were more polite said: "We will hear thee concerning this yet

again" (17:32). But they had heard all that they cared to hear then. Their eager curiosity was more than satisfied. Paul had gone beyond their depth. The Council evidently concluded that Paul was a harmless teacher and let it pass. Was Paul a disappointed preacher? Probably so, but he was not an unfaithful one. He had been loyal to the Lord Jesus in a difficult situation. He had at least borne his witness to Christ. And there was some result. Dionysius, a member of the Council, was converted. A woman named Damaris also took her stand for Christ. There were some others whose names are not given. The outcome was not brilliant as in Thessalonica, but it was worth while. A preacher's message always receives a varied reception. The seed falls on different kinds of soil as Jesus shows in his Parable of the Sower. Paul had not failed. He had preached Christ crucified and risen. He will stick to it. The Athenians may run after the latest fads in philosophy, if they will, but nothing but the Cross of Christ can save sinners in Athens or anywhere else.

THE END

227.06
R649 Robertson, A. T.
Paul, the interpreter of Christ

67231

SU6687

MAR 16

S 94

227.06
R649

SU6687

67231

Bethel Theological
SEMINARY
LIBRARY
New Brighton, Minn. - 55112

O6-AUD-527